

11  
11

Group FO  
Class 406  
Piece 36

*Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. February 1912.*

CONFIDENTIAL.

(9968.)

FO 406 / 36

F.O.

406

31  
N  
11

PART I.  
—

# EASTERN DEPARTMENT:

SECRET SERIES.

36

January to March 1911.

CONFIDENTIAL

(9966.)

PART I.

---

# EASTERN DEPARTMENT:

SECRET SERIES.

---

January to March 1911.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
1	Sir G. Buchanan ..	1 Tel.	Jan. 1, 1911	Trans-Persian railway. Russian consul-general at Calcutta reports Indian Government have no objection ..	1
2	" ..	496 Secret	Dec. 26, 1910	Russia and Austria. Possible effect of Count Asprentthal's resignation on Russo-Austrian relations. M. Sazonow's behaviour at Potsdam due to anxiety to keep Germany out of North Persia ..	1
3	" ..	497 Secret	26.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with M. Sazonow as to article 1 ..	2
4	" ..	498	26.	Trans-Persian railway. Minister for Foreign Affairs' views as to concession being Anglo-Russian or international. Strategic aspect. Route to be followed. Timirasoff's negotiations in London ..	4
5	Mr. Marling ..	931	26.	Bagdad Railway. Transmits despatch from Major Tyrrell reporting alteration of track so as to pass through Aleppo ..	5
6	India Office ..	..	Jan. 2, 1911	Trans-Persian railway. Telegram to Viceroy regarding Russia's desire for speedy opening of discussions ..	5
7	Sir F. Cartwright ..	4 Tel.	4.	Germany and Russia. Report that German Minister for Foreign Affairs said that Germany would hold Austria back if she showed disposition to alter status quo ..	6
8	Sir H. Babington Smith to Sir A. Nicolson ..	..	Dec. 30, 1910	Turkish loan. Conversation with M. Ravoll. Fusion question. Rumour that Ottoman bank is to arrange for large loan. Conversation with Hakkı Paşa. Attitude of Turkish Government towards National Bank and British commerce in general ..	6
9	" ..	..	30.	Bagdad Railway. Interview with Hakkı as to Kuwait. Cause of Turkish suspicion of His Majesty's Government. Germany must complete line to Bagdad. Suggested arrangement for Gulf section ..	9
10	India Office ..	..	Jan. 5, 1911	Trans-Persian railway. Transmits copy of telegram to Viceroy relative to trans-Persian railway and Russo-German draft agreement respecting Bagdad Railway ..	10
11	Extract from "Evening Times" ..	..	4.	Potsdam meeting. Text of draft agreement, with comments ..	13
12	Mr. Marling ..	14 Secret	4.	Bagdad Railway. Question whether moment has come to use our position at Kuwait as lever to obtain good terms regarding Gulf section ..	14
13	Sir G. Buchanan ..	11 Tel.	10.	Potsdam meeting. Asks if His Majesty's Government can discover how "Evening Times" got draft agreement ..	16
14	To Mr. Marling ..	11 Tel.	11.	Bagdad Railway. Asks for information with regard to certain points in "Evening Times" ..	16
15	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	9 Tel. Secret	11.	Potsdam meeting. "Evening Times" must have obtained draft agreement from Berlin or St. Petersburg on account of addition to paragraph 4 ..	17

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

iii

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
16	Sir G. Buchanan ..	15 Tel.	Jan. 12, 1911	Potsdam meeting. Article 4 of draft agreement refers to neutral zone. Sazonow says it was included in interest of Great Britain ..	17
17	To Mr. Marling ..	..	12.	Bagdad Railway. Refers to "Bagdad Railway," Part VIII, No. 112. Approves language ..	17
18	Mr. Marling ..	8 Tel.	13.	Potsdam meeting. Reports dissatisfaction in Young Turk circles with Germany and criticism of pro-German attitude of Cabinet ..	17
19	Sir G. Buchanan ..	14 Tel.	13.	Potsdam meeting. Refers to No. 16. Draft agreement. Minister for Foreign Affairs denies that Germany has been asking for right to seek for concessions in neutral zone. Whole text may have to be re-drafted but Sazonow raises objections to alterations desired by His Majesty's Government ..	18
20	Mr. Marling ..	9 Tel. Secret	14.	Bagdad Railway. Discussion has taken place as regards extension from Angora to Sivas. Minister of Finance has stated privately that he intends to allocate excess of tithe to extension to Bagdad ..	18
21	Sir G. Buchanan ..	15 Tel. Secret	14.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with Emperor: "Evening Times" article. Emperor says draft agreement only refers to line as far as Bagdad. French Minister for Foreign Affairs' speech ..	19
22	Mr. Marling ..	10 Tel.	15.	Potsdam meeting. Refers to No. 28. Inspected communiqué in "Tain" relative to German Ambassador's assurances to Turkish Government on subject of Russo-German agreement ..	19
23	Sir G. Buchanan ..	8	4.	Russia and Germany. Minister for Foreign Affairs' statements as to "Novoe Vremya" rumour that Russia was about to address a note to Germany about Middle East ..	20
24	" ..	11	16.	Potsdam meeting. Recapitulates recent divergent statements in foreign press and Minister for Foreign Affairs' explanations ..	20
25	" ..	12 Secret	10.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs: "Evening Times" article; neutral zone; question of redrafting whole agreement ..	21
26	Mr. Marling ..	23	11.	Potsdam meeting. Transmits article by Ismail Hakkı and comments on attitude of local press with regard to ..	23
27	Sir V. Corbett ..	3	12.	Potsdam meeting. Transmits substance of article in "Münchener Neueste Nachrichten" regarding ..	25
28	To Sir R. Redd ..	5	16.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with Italian Ambassador. "Daily News" article on Bagdad Railway and Potsdam negotiations ..	25
29	To Mr. Marling ..	14 Tel.	17.	Bagdad Railway. His Majesty's Government will give careful attention to any proposals of Turkish Government ..	26
30	To Sir F. Bertie ..	28 Secret	18.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with M. Cambon dealing with interview with Count Benckendorff (see No. 33). Probable revision of draft agreement. Intentions of His Majesty's Government and probable demands of French with regard to railways in Asiatic Turkey ..	26



No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
31	To Sir G. Buchanan.	6	Jan. 18, 1911	Potsdam meeting. Acknowledges No. 3, and approves language .. ..	27
32	" " "	17 Secret	18.	Potsdam meeting. Approves No. 21 .. ..	27
33	" " "	19 Secret	18.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with Count Benckendorff with regard to Bagdad Railway and Russia's attitude at Potsdam meeting .. ..	28
34	Sir F. Bertie	24 Confidential	19.	Potsdam meeting. French Minister for Foreign Affairs' speech, and his attempt to make Turkey dissatisfied with Germany's attitude at Potsdam. Russia and France .. ..	29
35	Sir F. Cartwright	8 Tel. Confidential	20.	Potsdam meeting. Testimony at Vienna to attribute inspiration of "Tunis" articles to Anglo-French intrigues. Germany probably responsible for these rumours .. ..	29
36	To India Office	" "	20.	Bagdad Railway. Transmits No. 12. Attitude His Majesty's Government should take up on possible settlement of Kuwait question in connection with Bagdad Railway .. ..	30
37	Sir G. Buchanan	18 Tel. Secret	22.	Potsdam meeting. Refers to No. 33. Four per cent. increase. Rumour that Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs thinks of ending entirely to Germany construction of Khanikin-Tehran line. Germany promising for revision of article 3. Reason for agreeing to German demands .. ..	31
38	Sir E. Goschen	15	14.	Potsdam meeting. Article by Professor Schlessman on Russia's relations with Great Britain and France. Article by Count Roventlow on Persia and Bagdad Railway. Insists that Gulf section, even if built by Germany, would be Turkish line .. ..	31
39	Mr. Marling	49 Confidential	17.	Potsdam meeting. Turkish Cabinet and German Ambassador's explanations. Anti-British and anti-Russian press articles .. ..	34
40	" " "	30 Secret	17.	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 12. Question of Kuwait being handed over in return for favourable settlement of outstanding questions. Question of publishing protocols over Kuwait in event of anarchy in Turkey .. ..	35
41	" " "	31 Confidential	17.	Bagdad Railway. Refers to "Bagdad Railway." Part VIII, No. 112. Turkish Ambassador in London will shortly submit proposals .. ..	36
42	India Office	" "	21.	Potsdam meeting. Transmits telegram to Viceroy as to article 4, neutral zone. Neutral section of Afghan frontier to be handed over to Russia and Germany .. ..	36
43	Sir G. Buchanan	19 Tel. Secret	24.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs regarding control of Tehran-Khanikin line .. ..	37
44	To Sir G. Lowther	25 Secret	24.	Bagdad Railway and Kuwait. Substance of interview with Tewfik. Readiness of His Majesty's Government to be approached in the matter .. ..	38
45	India Office	" "	25.	Trans-Persian railway. Transmits telegram from Viceroy as to advantage of extension of Russian zone for purpose of Russo-German agreement .. ..	38

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
46	To Sir F. Bertie	33	Jan. 26, 1911	Bagdad Railway. Transmits No. 44, and informs of statement to French Ambassador .. ..	39
47	" " "	34	26.	Bagdad Railway and Kuwait. Substance of interview with French Ambassador .. ..	39
48	Sir F. Cartwright	11 Tel. Meet. Conf.	27.	Potsdam meeting. Opinion in Austria. Uneasiness of Count d'Aehrenthal at delay in conclusion of negotiations and his suspicion that Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs is endeavouring to back out of his engagements .. ..	39
49	Sir F. Bertie	30 Confidential	26.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with French Minister for Foreign Affairs, who agrees with Sir A. Nicholson's observations to Count Benckendorff. France and Great Britain must prevent Germany from making any further backslidings .. ..	40
50	Mr. Greenway to Mr. Mallet	" "	7.	Persian railway construction. Effect of proposed Tehran-Khanikin line on British trade interests. Desirability of Great Britain obtaining concession for Ahwas-Baluchabad line .. ..	40
51	Sir G. Lowther	62	23.	Anglo-Turkish relations and Bagdad Railway. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs .. ..	41
52	Sir G. Buchanan	23 Secret	26.	Potsdam meeting. Further conversations as to draft agreement and question of German participation in Tehran-Khanikin line. Russia and proposed 4 per cent. customs increase. Mohammad-Ali-Khanikin Railway project .. ..	43
53	Sir E. Goschen	19	27.	Potsdam meeting. Transmits articles in "Koblenzer" and "Frankfurter Zeitung" on subject of "Evening Times" version of draft agreement and Turkish attitude to German assurances .. ..	45
54	Sir G. Buchanan	27 Tel. Secret	30.	Potsdam meeting. Tehran-Khanikin line. Minister of Finance's view. Germany and French lines .. ..	49
55	To Sir G. Buchanan.	29 Secret	31.	Potsdam meeting. Neutral zone. To inform Minister for Foreign Affairs that His Majesty's Government appreciate course of Russian Government, resting assured that they would not consent to concessions to third parties .. ..	49
56	" " "	31	31.	Potsdam meeting. Interview with Russian Ambassador. Tehran-Khanikin line and German participation. Russia should not commit herself as to 4 per cent. increase question .. ..	50
57	Sir F. Bertie	4 Tel. Confidential	Feb. 1.	Potsdam meeting. French Minister for Foreign Affairs gives substance of interview between M. Louie and M. Sazonov. Russia and Tehran-Khanikin line. Russia prepared to let Germany have construction if she can secure 60 per cent. of capital invested .. ..	50
58	" " "	5 Tel. Confidential	1.	Potsdam meeting. Conversation with French Minister for Foreign Affairs. M. Louie and M. Sazonov. French Government and questions of concessions in Northern Persia .. ..	51



No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
59	Sir G. Buchanan ..	23 Tel. Secret	Feb. 1, 1911	Bagdad Railway. German concession and proposed branch line to Kharpet. Article 12 of concession. Possibility of branch lines westward. M. Sazonow's views ..	51
60	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	21 Tel. Secret	1,	Potsdam meeting. Refers to No. 54. Danger if Germany secures control of Tehran-Kharpet line. Suggestion of British participation in construction. Alternative of internationalisation ..	52
61	To Sir F. Bertie ..	14 Tel.	2,	Tehran-Kharpet line. No means that line should be international only if Russia relinquishes option of making it herself ..	52
62	Sir F. Bertie ..	6 Tel. Secret	4,	Potsdam meeting. Tehran-Kharpet line. French Minister for Foreign Affairs concurs in suggestions of No. 60. His view of possible unwarmed arrangements. Simultaneous statement by three <i>Evans</i> Powers ..	53
63	Sir G. Buchanan ..	26 Tel.	4,	Potsdam meeting. Tehran-Kharpet line. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs as to internationalisation of line and attitude which Germany will adopt if question is put ..	53
64	" ..	29 Tel. Secret	6,	Potsdam meeting. Tehran-Kharpet line. Refers to No. 63. Revised text of agreement to be ready in week. Proposed formula ..	54
65	To Sir G. Lowther ..	34 Secret	6,	Bagdad Railway. France and England. Conversation with French Ambassador as to Anglo-French statements at St. Petersburg as to position of England and France regarding Bagdad Railway ..	54
66	" Sir F. Bertie ..	53 Secret			
67	To Sir G. Lowther ..	35 Secret	6,	Bagdad Railway negotiations. Conversation with Turkish Ambassador as to manner and place of opening negotiations ..	55
68	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	34	6,	Tehran-Kharpet line. Conversation with Russian Ambassador as to participation of British capital, &c. ..	55
69	Sir F. Bertie ..	65 Secret	5,	Tehran-Kharpet line. Refers to No. 62. Transmits copy of memorandum handed to Minister for Foreign Affairs. French Ambassador at St. Petersburg instructed to co-operate with Sir G. Buchanan ..	56
70	Sir G. Lowther ..	29 Tel.	7,	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 70. Conversation with French Ambassador. Desirable in view of negotiations between Porte and company for completion of line up to Bagdad, that British and French Governments should take action, and only consent to 4 per cent. increase if negotiations for completion of line up to Bagdad are conducted <i>à quater</i> ..	57
71	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	34 Tel.	7,	Tehran-Kharpet Railway. Approves No. 65. Refers to No. 60. To press formula suggested upon Minister for Foreign Affairs. Advantages of this ..	57
72	To Sir G. Lowther ..	40 Secret	7,	Anglo-Turkish relations. Acknowledges No. 51, and approves language ..	58
73	To Treasury ..	"	7,	Railway concessions in Persia. Survey of Hafez - Bazar railway section of proposed Moamerah-Kharpet line. Suggests postponement ..	58

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
73	To India Office ..	"	Feb. 7, 1911	Railway concessions in Persia. Refers to No. 52. Hafez-Bazar railway survey. Suggests postponing ..	59
74	Sir G. Buchanan ..	30 Tel. Secret	8,	Tehran-Kharpet line. Minister for Foreign Affairs' change of tone. Modifications in draft agreement ..	59
75	Sir F. Bertie ..	7 Tel.	9,	Bagdad Railway. 4 per cent. increase. Refers to No. 74. Conversation with French Minister for Foreign Affairs. French and British Governments and 4 per cent. increase. Stamp tax ..	60
76	To Sir F. Bertie ..	18 Tel. Secret	9,	France and Bagdad Railway. To inform French Minister for Foreign Affairs that His Majesty's Government do not wish to risk a refusal by making suggested representations, as they have no legal ground whatever ..	61
77	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	38 Secret	9,	Tehran-Kharpet line. Conversation with Russian Ambassador as to participation of British capital ..	61
78	Sir G. Buchanan ..	33 Tel. Secret	10,	Russo-German draft agreement. Refers to No. 74. Remodelling of draft agreement. M. Sazonow's statements as to ..	61
79	To Sir G. Lowther ..	29 Tel.	10,	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 75. Asks views as to revenue company may expect Porte to earmark for their use ..	62
80	Sir G. Buchanan ..	33 Tel. Secret	11,	Tehran-Kharpet line. Refers to No. 74. Minister for Foreign Affairs never had intention of letting control of line pass into German hands. Participation of British capital. Revised version of draft agreement read to his Excellency by Minister for Foreign Affairs ..	62
81	Sir G. Lowther ..	34 Tel.	11,	Bagdad Railway. Estimate of amount of needed revenues. Requirements for 12 Half-Bagdad section. Company wish for additional guarantee ..	63
82	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	41 Tel. Secret	11,	Draft agreement. Refers to No. 80. To thank Minister for Foreign Affairs ..	63
83	Sir G. Lowther ..	36 Tel.	12,	Four per cent. increase and Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 81. "Tanin" states that no connection between them ..	63
84	" ..	37 Tel.	12,	Agreement between Bagdad Railway Company and Turkish Government. Considers some communication desirable as agreement imminent ..	64
85	Sir G. Buchanan ..	29	Jan. 31,	Trans-Persian railway. Reports communications in press. Minister for Foreign Affairs says there can be no idea of Government guarantee ..	64
86	" ..	33	Feb. 6,	Interpretation of Anglo-Russian Agreement. Refers to No. 55. Minister for Foreign Affairs' assurances as to neutral zone in Persia ..	65
87	Sir G. Lowther ..	90	8,	Bagdad Railway. Negotiations. Refers to No. 69. Transmits semi-official communiqué respecting progress of ..	65
88	Sir G. Buchanan ..	37	9,	Potsdam meeting. Refers to No. 54. Summarises negotiations of past fortnight regarding Tehran-Kharpet Railway and revised text of agreement ..	65



No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
89	Sir E. Speyer ..	..	Feb. 13, 1911	Turkish loan and Bagdad Railway. Suggests that he should try to obtain 4,000,000l. option stock of last Turkish loan and issue it in England .. ..	69
90	Sir G. Buchanan ..	36 Tel. Secret	13.	Railways in Northern Persia. Minister for Foreign Affairs' satisfaction at No. 82, offering British participation in Tehran-Khanikin line. Necessity of assurances of financial assistance from London and Paris as to Tehran-Khanikin line and Enzeli-Tehran before revised draft agreement is returned to German Ambassador ..	70
91	Sir G. Lowther ..	38 Tel.	14.	Bagdad Railway. Gives account of basis upon which Turkish Government are conducting negotiations with company for cession of revenues for extension of line .. ..	70
92	To Sir G. Barclay ..	32 Tel. Confidential	14.	Railways in Southern Persia. Question of building in order to protect British commercial interests. Mr. Wilson might survey Isfah-Burajird section ..	71
93	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	49 Tel.	14.	Railways in Northern Persia. Refers to No. 90. Impossible to obtain British capital for Enzeli-Tehran Tehran-Khanikin lines without some sort of Government guarantee. His Majesty's Government's intentions with regard to railways in Southern Persia ..	72
94	Sir E. Goschen ..	36	13.	Bagdad Railway. Statements in German press as to participation of English and French capital .. ..	72
95	Sir G. Buchanan ..	39 Tel. Secret	15.	Russo-German negotiations. Tehran-Khanikin line. Russian financial difficulties and reluctance of His Majesty's Government to pledge themselves to participation may make it necessary to hand over line to Germany. Question of Tehran-Enzeli line .. ..	73
96	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	46	15.	Railways in Persia. Refers to No. 96. British investors would want guarantees from His Majesty's Government and Russian Government as to southern railways and Tehran-Khanikin line ..	74
97	" .. ..	47	15.	Bagdad Railway. Has informed Russian Ambassador that His Majesty's Government have expressed their willingness to receive Turkish proposals ..	74
98	To Sir F. Bertie ..	32 Tel.	16.	Tehran-Khanikin line. Attitude of His Majesty's Government towards railways in Persia .. ..	75
99	To Sir G. Lowther ..	40 Tel.	16.	Turkish negotiations regarding Bagdad Railway. His Majesty's Government willing to receive proposals ..	75
100	To Sir E. Goschen ..	45 Secret	16.	Exchange of naval information and Bagdad Railway. Conversation with German Ambassador as to British aims and ambitions in Persia .. ..	75
101	To Sir E. Speyer ..	..	16.	Turkish loan. Refers to No. 89. His Majesty's Government cannot control operations of British money market, and cannot give advice on the subject ..	76

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
102	Telegram communicated by India Office ..	..	Feb. 17, 1911	Mohammerah-Khoremsabad line. Transmits India Office telegram to Viceroy asking for his Excellency's views .. ..	76
103	Sir F. Bertie ..	10 Tel. Secret	17.	Railways in Northern Persia. Russian Ambassador in Paris told that French Government cannot guarantee money for Tehran-Enzeli line .. ..	77
104	" .. ..	11 Tel. Secret	17.	Potsdam meeting. French Minister for Foreign Affairs has been assured by Russian Ambassador that there was no secret agreement at Potsdam ..	77
105	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	55 Tel.	17.	Railways in Persia. Tehran-Khanikin line would not find investors in England without Government guarantee .. ..	77
106	Telegram communicated by India Office ..	..	18.	Rowett. Enquires as to position of in event of internationalisation of Bagdad Railway .. ..	78
107	Sir G. Buchanan ..	42 Tel. Secret	18.	Potsdam meeting and draft agreement. Refers to No. 105. Particulars of latest revision of draft .. ..	78
108	" .. ..	48 Tel.	18.	Railways in Southern Persia. Mohammerah-Khanikin line. Probable effect of its construction on Gulf section. Views of Minister for Foreign Affairs and of Ministers of Finance and Commerce ..	79
109	To Sir F. Bertie ..	38 Tel. Secret	18.	Potsdam meeting. Refers to No. 104. His Majesty's Government's attitude as to rumours of secret agreement ..	79
110	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	55	18.	Tehran-Khanikin Railway guarantee. Proposal to raise sum internationally. Conversation with Russian Ambassador ..	79
111	Sir G. Lowther ..	95	11.	Bagdad Railway construction. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Teheran as to transfer of 125,000 tons of rails .. ..	80
112	" .. ..	100 Confidential	14.	Gulf section of Bagdad Railway. Rifat Pasha on Ferte's negotiations with Bagdad Railway Company, and as to solution of question of Gulf section (see No. 113) ..	80
113	" .. ..	106	15.	Kawez. Refers to No. 112. Comments on Rifat Pasha's suggestions. Article in "Times" .. ..	81
114	Sir G. Barclay ..	53 Tel.	20.	Railways in Southern Persia. Concurs in first three paragraphs of No. 92. Advisable to postpone demand for option, as action at this moment might embarrass Regent. Lieutenant Wilson's survey ..	83
115	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	49	20.	Potsdam meeting. Approves language of No. 88 .. ..	84
116	Sir G. Buchanan ..	46 Tel.	31.	Russo-German draft agreement. Draft agreement handed to German Ambassador. Minister for Foreign Affairs enquires as to negotiations between Great Britain and Turkey .. ..	84
117	To Sir G. Barclay ..	54 Tel.	21.	Railways in Southern Persia. Agrees to postponement suggested in No. 114. Enquires views as to commercial value of Mohammerah line .. ..	84



No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
118	To Sir G. Buchanan.	65 Tel.	Feb. 21, 1911	Dizful-Burujird survey. Refers to No. 108. Asks views of his Excellency as to advisability of obtaining Russian concurrence. No survey to be made in Russian sphere .. .. .	84
119	Sir E. Speyer ..	Private	20.	Turkish loan and Bagdad Railway. Question of issuing Turkish bonds in England ..	85
120	Sir G. Buchanan ..	48 Tel.	22.	Railways in Southern Persia. Refers to No. 118. Recommends consulting Minister for Foreign Affairs before commencing proposed survey of Dizful-Burujird line ..	85
121	To Sir G. Buchanan.	64 Tel.	22.	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 116. Gulf section. No proposals as yet received from Turkish Government. Russian Government will be kept informed of course of negotiations .. .. .	85
122	To Sir E. Speyer ..	Private	22.	Turkish loan and Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 112. His Majesty's Government cannot undertake any responsibility ..	86
123	Sir F. Bertie ..	86	22.	Franco-Russian alliance. Russian Ambassador asserts that interview inserted in "Liber Parole" never took place at all ..	86
124	Sir G. Buchanan ..	49 Tel. Secret	24.	Railways in Southern Persia. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs. His assumption that rumours as to His Majesty's Government's intentions with regard to Mohammerah-Kharan line are unfounded .. .. .	86
125	" .. ..	46 Secret	21.	Russo-German draft agreement. Refers to No. 82. Summarises conversations with Minister for Foreign Affairs relative to revised version. Minister for Foreign Affairs is to present to German Ambassador Tehran-Kharan-Kharan-Tehran line. British intentions with regard to railways in South Persia. British negotiations with Turkey on subject of Gulf section of Bagdad Railway .. .. .	86
126	Sir G. Lowther ..	120 Confidential	21.	Bagdad Railway and Kuwait. Refers to No. 113. Press rumours as to impending understanding between Porte and His Majesty's Government. Conversation with Grand Vizier. Transmits article by Ismail Hakkî Babuszade in "Tanin" of 20th February on subject of Kuwait. ..	90
127	Telegram communicated by India Office ..	..	23.	Future status of Kuwait and possible concessions to Turkey. Visit of Resident, Persian Gulf, to Sheikh, and discussion as to. Transmits telegram from Viceroy respecting .. .. .	92
128	Sir G. Barclay ..	68 Tel.	27.	Railways in South Persia. Refers to No. 117. Preference of His Majesty's Minister for Mohammerah-Khorramabad line. Possible lines from Abwas to Shiraz and Bander Abbas and from Bander Abbas to Kerman ..	94
129	Telegram communicated by India Office ..	..	23.	Railways in Persia. Transmits telegram from Viceroy. Mohammerah-Khorramabad line useless if trans-Persian railway is built. Recommends line from Mohammerah to Bander Abbas and from Kerman to Bander Abbas .. .. .	92
130	Lord Grimthorpe ..	..	26.	Julfa-Tahreez Railway. Transmits papers concerning scheme for .. .. .	95

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
131	Sir G. Lowther ..	52 Tel.	Mar. 1, 1911	Bagdad Railway. Summarises Turkish proposals respecting Gulf section for formation of new company. Capital to be furnished by Porte, Great Britain, Germany, and France, and settling of political status of Kuwait as ideal terminus port ..	97
132	To Sir G. Lowther ..	56 Tel.	2.	Bagdad Railway. Asks whether Turkish proposals as recorded in No. 131 have been made with approval and cognisance of German Government .. .. .	97
133	India Office ..	..	3.	Bagdad Railway and Kuwait. Transmits No. 127, and lays down necessary conditions antecedent to any concession by His Majesty's Government to Turkish Government as to position of Kuwait .. .. .	97
134	Sir G. Lowther ..	56 Tel.	5.	Bagdad Railway. In reply to No. 132, German Government generally cognisant of nature of proposals of Turkish Government respecting Gulf section. German condition that no foreign group should have larger share in Gulf section than Germans ..	98
135	" .. ..	124	Feb. 28.	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 83. Transmits memorandum by commercial attaché on subject of funds available for kilometre guarantees .. .. .	98
136	" .. ..	135 Confidential	Mar. 1.	Bagdad Railway. Transmits memorandum communicated by Minister for Foreign Affairs setting forth proposals which Porte desire to lay before His Majesty's Government, with a view to arriving at an understanding in matter of Bagdad-Gulf section .. .. .	103
137	Sir V. Corbett ..	17	2.	Bagdad Railway and opinion in Southern Germany. Comments in "Frankfurter Zeitung" .. .. .	105
138	Sir G. Barclay ..	75 Tel.	6.	Railways in Southern Persia. Refers to No. 128. Suggests that before applying for option British house should be prompted to apply for concession that would, if granted, be of most use to His Majesty's Government. Manager of Imperial Bank and Vekil-ul-Hoya .. .. .	106
139	Telegram communicated by India Office ..	..	3.	Railways in Southern Persia. Refers to No. 133. Asks Viceroy's views as to potential value of Mohammerah-Khorramabad in the event of Bagdad Railway being extended to the Gulf and trans-Persian railway not being built at all .. .. .	106
140	" .. ..	..	3.	Bagdad Railway. Transmits telegram to Viceroy summarising Turkish proposals for completion of Bagdad-Gulf section ..	106
141	Sir F. Cartwright ..	17 Tel.	7.	Russo-German draft agreement. Conversation with Count d'Ashrental. His view as to stage negotiations begun at Potsdam have reached .. .. .	107
142	Telegram communicated by India Office ..	..	7.	Railways in Southern Persia. Refers to No. 140. Mohammerah-Khorramabad line becomes of primary importance if trans-Persian railway scheme falls through ..	107
143	" .. ..	..	7.	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 140. Turkish proposals for internationalisation of Gulf section unacceptable .. .. .	107



No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
144	To Lord Grimthorpe ..	..	Mar. 8, 1911	Jaffa - Tabreez Railway. Acknowledges No. 130. No objection to scheme therein outlined if Russian Government willing ..	107
145	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	71 Confidential	8,	Jaffa - Tabreez Railway. Transmits correspondence with Lord Grimthorpe, and asks for information respecting project ..	108
146	Sir E. Goschen ..	55	7,	Bagdad Railway. Transmits articles in "Norddeutsche Zeitung" and "Frankfurter Zeitung" ..	108
147	To Sir G. Lowther ..	61 Tel. Secret	9,	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 136. Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs should be informed that his proposal will be considered, but that Turkish Government have misconceived attitude of His Majesty's Government respecting conditions subject to which they would assent to 4 per cent. customs increase ..	109
148	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	84 Tel. Secret	8,	Mohammerah - Khorezabad line. His Majesty's Government will shortly have to apply for option to construct. Asks his Excellency's views as to best means of obtaining Russian Government's support (see No. 149) ..	109
149	Sir G. Buchanan ..	84 Tel.	10,	Mohammerah-Khorezabad Railway. Refers to No. 148. Points His Majesty's Government will probably have to make in order to overcome Russian opposition ..	109
150	Sir G. Lowther ..	58 Tel.	10,	Bagdad Railway. Suggests that communication to Ports respecting 4 per cent. should take form of notice instead of official signed note ..	110
151	Extract from "Parliamentary Debates" ..	..	8,	Bagdad Railway and Persia. Debate in House of Commons ..	110
152	Lord Grimthorpe ..	..	9,	Jaffa - Tabreez Railway. Acknowledges No. 144. His Majesty's Government will be informed of terms of Russian Government before contract is signed ..	114
153	Sir G. Buchanan ..	55 Tel. Secret	11,	Mohammerah-Khorezabad line. Refers to No. 149. Advisability of approaching Prime Minister on question. Suggests presenting confidential memorandum ..	115
154	To Sir G. Lowther ..	58 Tel.	11,	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 150. Communication in writing must be made, but discretion allowed as to exact form ..	115
155	Sir E. Goschen ..	65	10,	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 151. Summarises newspaper comments on Sir E. Grey's speech of 8th March in House of Commons ..	116
156	" ..	66	11,	Bagdad Railway. Great Britain and German press. Articles in various papers ..	118
157	Extract from the "Times" ..	..	11,	Bagdad Railway. Article in "North German Gazette" ..	118
158	" ..	..	12,	Railways in Asia Minor. Letter from Veritas ..	119
159	" ..	..	13,	Bagdad Railway. Turkish views ..	121
160	Sir U. Lowther ..	134	10,	Bagdad Railway and 4 per cent. customs increase. Article by Jacht in "Talis" ..	121

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
161	Extract from the "Times" ..	..	Mar. 14, 1911	Kilometric guarantees. Letter from "Probitas" regarding ..	122
162	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	87 Tel. Secret	14,	Mohammerah-Khorezabad line. Refers to No. 153. May hand memorandum to Prime Minister, but must mention trade in Western Persia more than trade in Northern Persia ..	123
163	To Sir F. Bertie ..	90	14,	Bagdad Railway and Koweit. Interview with French Ambassador, who regards Turkish proposals as unacceptable. He has been informed that Turkish Government regard this only as a first step ..	124
164	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	78	14,	Trans-Persian railway. Interview with Russian Ambassador, who asks if His Majesty's Government can say anything sympathetic regarding question of guarantee ..	124
165	" ..	79	14,	Bagdad and Persian railways. Russian Ambassador has been given same information as that recorded in No. 89 to Sir F. Bertie ..	125
166	Extract from the "Morning Post" ..	..	13,	Bagdad Railway. French Government's attitude. Article as to ..	125
167	Sir E. Goschen ..	67	14,	Koweit and 4 per cent. increase. Reports appreciative comment in "Norddeutsche Zeitung" on Sir E. Grey's speech ..	128
168	To India Office ..	Secret	16,	Bagdad Railway and Koweit. Replies to No. 155. Question of whether His Majesty's Government should insist on preponderating share in Gulf section. General question of solution of Bagdad Railway problem. Koweit ..	129
169	To Board of Trade ..	Secret	16,	Bagdad Railway and Koweit. Transmits papers relating to. Asks for detailed information regarding transit rates and internationalisation ..	141
170	Sir G. Lowther ..	136	10,	Bagdad Railway and Koweit. Four per cent. increase. Transmits Grand Vizier's recent speech concerning company's claim. Conversation with Grand Vizier. Conditions of assent of His Majesty's Government to 4 per cent. increase ..	142
171	Paper communicated by Mr. Jackson ..	..	10,	Trans-Persian railway. Russian Government's answer to proposal favourable. Comments on ..	144
172	Sir V. Corbett ..	20	14,	Bagdad Railway and Koweit. Comments in "Frankfurter Zeitung" on Sir E. Grey's speech ..	144
173	Sir G. Lowther ..	62 Tel.	16,	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 112. Ottoman Government on point of signing convention for completion of section El Half to Bagdad. Terms of convention ..	145
174	Sir G. Buchanan ..	58 Tel.	19,	Mohammerah-Khorezabad line. Refers to No. 162. Conversation with Prime Minister as to Russian objections to the line ..	146
175	Sir G. Lowther ..	137	11,	Turkey, Germany, and Great Britain. Article in "Talis" discussing relations ..	147



No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
176	Sir G. Lowther ..	160	Mar. 13, 1911	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 154. Transmits "notice" relative to Turkish Government's misconception on subject of His Majesty's Government's attitude regarding 4 per cent. increase .. ..	148
177	" .. ..	169	15,	Great Britain and Turkey. Transmits article in "Times" regarding British "pretensions" to Kuwait .. ..	149
178	" .. ..	170	15,	Bagdad Railway construction. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Adana regarding delay in .. ..	153
179	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	93 Tel.	26,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad line. Refers to No. 174. Approves language. True commercial effect of line not sufficiently realized by Russian Government .. ..	153
180	To India Office ..	Confidential	29,	Trans-Persian railway. Transmits No. 171 and expresses views. Hopes India Office will be as favourable to subject as the Russian Government .. ..	154
181	Enclosures in India Office Letter ..	..	21,	Koweit. Transmits correspondence between political agent, Koweit, and Colonel Cox in connection with apprehended attack by Muntakib force .. ..	154
182	Note communicated by Turkish Ambassador ..	..	21,	Bagdad Railway. Agreement between Turkish Government and company. Transmits .. ..	160
183	Sir G. Buchanan ..	62 Tel.	21,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad line. Refers to No. 174. Omission of remark to Prime Minister as to commercial effects of line .. ..	161
184	Sir G. Lowther ..	63 Tel.	21,	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 181. Three conventions signed as to: (1) Haid-Bagdad Railway; (2) Qumash to Alexandria; (3) Alexandretta port .. ..	161
184*	Sir G. Barclay ..	99 Tel.	21,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad railway project. Conversation of Mr. Greenway with Regent, who encouraged idea .. ..	161*
185	To Admiralty ..	..	21,	Bagdad terminus at Ras Tanura. Enquires as to fitness of site reported to be selected by German Government .. ..	161
186	Sir G. Buchanan ..	65 Tel.	22,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad line. Conversation with Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs. Russia feels Khorramabad is too near Russian zone. Karun route. Encouragement of British capital for Khorramabad line as <i>quid pro quo</i> for Russian consent to Mohammerah line .. ..	162
187	To Sir G. Barclay ..	84 Tel.	22,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad line. Is it desirable to remind Regent of Shah's undertaking? .. ..	163
188	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	87	22,	Railways in Persia. Conversation with Russian Ambassador. Vital that His Majesty's Government should obtain Mohammerah-Khorramabad concession in view of recent events .. ..	162
188*	Sir G. Barclay ..	91 Tel.	23,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad railway project. Refers to No. 167. Russian Minister at Tehran has advised his Government that, in view of what took place in 1908, Russian Government could hardly oppose .. ..	163*

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
189	Board of Trade ..	..	Mar. 22, 1911	Gulf section. Refers to No. 169. Suggests informal inter-departmental conference .. ..	163
189*	Sir G. Barclay ..	92 Tel.	24,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad railway project. Refers to No. 187. Thinks reminder should be sent to Minister for Foreign Affairs and not to Regent. Explains attitude of Persians .. ..	163*
190	To Sir G. Buchanan ..	99 Tel.	24,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad line. Refers to No. 186. Are Russian Government willing for His Majesty's Government to apply for option of constructing line? No terminus suitable further away from Khorramabad than Khorramabad. His Majesty's Government will interest British capital in Khorramabad line .. ..	163
191	Sir G. Lowther ..	67 Tel.	25,	Mesopotamian irrigation. Bagdad-Bussorah Railway could not be built until irrigation works are more advanced .. ..	164
191	" .. ..	68 Tel.	26,	Bagdad Railway terminus port. Asks for name of informant regarding Ras Tanura .. ..	164
192	Sir G. Buchanan ..	70 Tel.	26,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad line. Refers to No. 190. Russian Government still object to His Majesty's Government applying for option. Reply delayed by Ministerial crisis .. ..	164
194	" .. ..	68	29,	Mohammerah-Khorramabad Railway. Conversations with Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs as to Russian attitude .. ..	166
195	Sir G. Lowther ..	193 Confidential	22,	Bagdad Railway and Koweit. Refers to No. 184. Transmits translations of conventions between company and Turkish Government. Suggests more satisfactory arrangement regarding Gulf section .. ..	167
196	Sir G. Buchanan ..	67 Confidential	22,	Julla-Tabresa Railway. Negotiations between Williams and Minister of Finance. Question of guarantee. All Russian Government have to offer is their stock in existing road concession .. ..	172
197	Sir E. Goschen ..	71	24,	Bagdad Railway Company's agreements. Official communiqué and various press comments .. ..	172
197*	Sir G. Barclay ..	96 Tel. Confidential	27,	Railways in Persia. Refers to Nos. 184* and 189*. Regent proposes discussion with British and Russian Ministers as to general scheme on international basis .. ..	174*
198	To Sir G. Barclay ..	91 Tel.	27,	Persian railways. Refers to No. 184*. Transport company. Requests opinion .. ..	175
199	To Sir G. Lowther ..	75 Tel.	27,	Bagdad Railway. To communicate No. 191 to Sir H. Barington Smith, and ask if report coincides with that of Mr. Money .. ..	175
200	Sir H. Barington Smith to Sir A. Nicolson ..	..	16,	Bagdad Railway. Gulf section. Danger of differential rates. Railway loan. Four-powers between Porte, French Ambassador, and Ottoman Bank. Semsum-Sivas Railway. Chester scheme .. ..	175
201	Telegram communicated by India Office ..	..	17,	Bagdad Railway terminus. Rumour as to Ras Tanura. Telegram from Viceroy .. ..	176



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

No.	Name	A	B	Subject	Page
202	1880-1881	14	Mar 8 1881	Railways in Asia Minor. Conversation with French Ambassador as to French railway concessions in Asia Minor, 4 per cent customs increase, and His Majesty's Government's policy regarding Bagdad	17
203	Sir G. Buchanan	11	28	M. A. ...	18
204	To Sir G. Lowther	"	"	...	19
205	Sir G. Lowther	"	"	Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 1880-1881, and to the declaration of the Bagdad Railway, and to the revenues available for Bagdad section	19
206	70 Tel	29	29	Bagdad Railway. I ...	20
207	"	"	29	Bagdad Bagdad Railway force. Routes considered by Mr. Murray, No. 11 Bag	21
208	To Sir G. Buchanan	98 Tel	"	...	22
209	"	100 Tel	"	...	23
210	To Sir G. Lowther	"	"	...	24
211	"	"	"	...	25
212	Mr. R. Grant Duff	"	"	England at Kuwait. Transmits advice in	26
213	"	"	"	Bagdad Railway. Telegram to Government of India, expressing present state of relations and attitude of His Majesty's Government, and asking for opinion	27
214	"	"	"	Bagdad Railway conventions. Repeats No. 194 to India	28
215	"	"	"	...	29
216	Sir G. Lowther	"	"	Bagdad Bagdad Railway. Refers to No. 210. Gives position of Bagdad	30
217	"	"	"	...	31
218	To Sir G. Buchanan	"	"	Perman. Transport company and railways in Persia. His Majesty's Government's reply to application, if put in, by company	32

No.	Name	No.	Date	SUBJECT	Page
219	Extract from "Parliamentary Debates"		Mar. 22, 1911	Debate respecting Persia and Asia Minor Extract from official report	27
220	Lord Grimthorpe	5		Jafar-Tanousz Railway. Sir P. ... negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily	206
221	Persian Transport			Persian Transport Company. His Majesty's Government would deprecate application concession at present moment, but will consider in mind assurances given in the past	201



CONFIDENTIAL

Eastern Department: Secret Series.

PART I.

1

No. 1

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 1.)

(No. 1.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

St. Petersburg, January 1, 1911

SCHEME for a railway across Persia. My despatch No. 498 of the 26th December last.

The Russian consul general at Calcutta has informed M. Sazonow that the Government of India will raise no objections to the trans-Persian railway scheme, and M. Sazonow has expressed to me the great satisfaction which this intelligence has given him.

I was informed in confidence by M. Sazonow that at the recent meeting of the Ministers held to discuss this question, the only Minister who did not speak was the Minister of Commerce. He put forward the arguments of Moscow against the scheme, but the Minister refuted them successfully. The whole scheme is now to be submitted to a representative committee, which will include M. Sazonow, and his Excellency expects that in about a month's time he will be in a position to communicate to us the decision of the Russian Government.

[48]

No. 2

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 2, 1911.)

N. 496. Secret

St. Petersburg, December 26, 1910

I HAVE in another despatch recorded the bitter language used by the "Novoe Vremya" in speaking of Austria in connection with the Wasatch trial, which has just been concluded at Belgrade.

The language held to me by the "Novoe Vremya" in connection with the Wasatch trial, which has just been concluded at Belgrade, shows no sign of abatement. M. Izvolsky has handed down to his successor a political legacy of profound distrust and dislike of that statesman, and this fact, coupled with the knowledge that the Emperor shares this personal resentment, is likely to prevent M. Sazonow attempting to bring about an Austro-Russian rapprochement so long as the foreign policy of the Dual Monarchy is controlled by Count Aehrenthal. Were the latter to disappear from Russia's wounded vanity.

Germany, on the other hand, has also reasons of her own for wishing to see

more pliable and subservient Minister installed at the Ballplatz, and from the Chancellor's recent declarations on German policy in the Near East and from the violent articles published in the Russian press, it would almost seem that the two Governments had agreed to open a campaign against his Excellency for the purpose of discrediting him and encompassing his fall. Should these efforts be crowned with success, the way would be prepared for supplementing the Russo-German agreement respecting Persia and the Bagdad Railway by some kind of an understanding between Austria and Russia with regard to the Balkans. Were this latter to take the form which M. Isvolsky desired to give to the abortive conversations which took place between St. Petersburg and Vienna last spring, and were the other Powers consequently to be invited to subscribe to its provisions, it would be a most important instrument for the maintenance of peace in the Near East. Were it, however, as impossible, to be in the nature of a secret agreement between the two Cabinets, of which Germany, as Austria's ally, would alone have cognisance, it might seriously affect the value of the Triple Entente as a counterpoise to Austro-German ascendancy in Europe.

At the present moment both the Emperor and his Government are, I believe, sincerely anxious to adhere loyally to their alliance with France and to their understanding with England, but the course which the present negotiations with Germany have taken leads me to fear that when it is a question of securing

the peace or inordinate interest Russia may drift towards Germany. For must it be forgotten that the reactionary party in Russia inclines much more warmly towards Germany than towards England, while there are not wanting those who are in favour of being on the side of the big battalions.

M. Sazonov's desire to prevent Germany poaching in the Russian preserves in North Persia accounts for the haste with which he has made proposals respecting Persia and the Bagdad Railway without consulting our views or wishes. He was, it is not bound to do so by the terms of the Anglo-Russian agreement, but he has allowed himself open to the reproach of not having observed the spirit of the tacit understanding, according to which no arrangement was to be concluded with any respecting the Bagdad Railway by way one of the parties to the Triple Entente until the other two had also come to terms with her. The temptation to secure favourable conditions with regard to North Persia was too strong for him, and he either drafted or accepted the text of the 1st article of the draft agreement without reflecting on the difficulties which it might occasion in the future. As an instance of his careless habit of doing business I may mention that, though I informed him of this before my audience with the Emperor of the general purport of the language which I proposed to hold to His Majesty, he never told me till afterwards that he had not yet submitted the draft agreement to His Majesty. I was naturally, therefore, under the impression that such an important State document could not have been submitted to the German Government without the Emperor's express sanction. Fortunately, however, I did not make any reference to it in the course of my conversation with His Majesty, but had I unwittingly done so it would have been interesting to have heard what the Emperor would have said on learning that I was better acquainted than himself with details of the secret negotiations which his Foreign Minister was conducting with

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey, - Received January 2, 1911.

(No. 497 Secret.)

Sir,

St. Petersburg, December 26, 1910

In the course of a conversation which I had with the Minister for Foreign Affairs this afternoon, I reverted to the subject of the draft agreement which he had submitted to the German Government respecting Persia and the Bagdad Railway. I said that his Excellency would no doubt already have learnt from Count Benckendorff that its first article, if read by anyone unacquainted with the explanations which he had given, could only in your opinion imply that Russia was consenting to abandon all opposition to the realisation of the whole Bagdad Railway project, and that the limited construction which he was putting on it gave a quite new interpretation to the recognised

meaning of the term "Bagdad Railway". If, moreover, his Excellency's view as to the meaning of article I was correct, it was difficult to see what advantages Germany could derive from the draft agreement in return for the concessions which she was making in North Persia. I also repeated to M. Sazonov what you, Sir, had said to me at Berlin—that, should his Majesty's Government ever find that a satisfactory arrangement could be made with Germany respecting the Gulf section, and that Russia and France had been able to make such an arrangement as satisfied their respective interests, and that, although the negotiations might proceed separately, no settlement ought to be arrived at until all three Governments were satisfied.

M. Sazonov did not take up this last point except to explain that he had been charged to telegraph to Count Benckendorff, instructing him to correct the statement which his Excellency had made to you as to the agreement respecting the linking up of the two railway systems being contingent on the conclusion by His Majesty's Government of a satisfactory understanding with Germany respecting the Gulf section. As regarded, however, the wording of article I, he assured me that it had never struck him that it could bear any other interpretation than that which he had intended to give to it, and that, had he not thought so, he would certainly have worded it differently. On my enquiring whether he proposed to obtain from the German Government an assurance in writing that the right to construct the line from Suez to Khamkin should be ceded to Russia in the event of Great Britain obtaining the control over the Gulf section, M. Sazonov said that he had no such intention. During

his visit to Berlin the two questions of the Bagdad Railway and the whole Bagdad Railway had been treated separately. Russia had engaged not to oppose the realisation of the railway up to Bagdad, and had consented to the linking up of this railway with the future North Persian railway system by a line running from Suez to Khamkin, because she was powerless to prevent the realisation of either of these two schemes. Before the Potsdam interview the relations between the two Governments had been very strained, and he had lived in daily dread of receiving the news that Germany had obtained from the Persian Government the concession for the Khamkin Tehran line. The counter-concessions which he had extracted from Germany were of the greatest importance to Russia, while the engagements which the latter had taken would be a moral satisfaction to German public opinion, and would give German trade an access to the Persian markets. Great Britain had nothing to fear from the terms of the first article. The position of the Russian Government with regard to any line running from Bagdad either to the Gulf or to the Mediterranean would be exactly the same as it was before that article had been drafted. As he had told me already, he did not for one moment believe that Germany could ever construct a line to the Gulf without our assistance, but if the worst came to the worst, and Russia had to give us her support, the only result would be a possible "new" between us.

I observed that even in my own small experience I had seen cases where considerable complications had ensued in consequence of a treaty being so loosely worded that either party to it could interpret it in the sense most favourable to its interests. I understood from what he had told me at our first interview that he expected that the German Government would not accept the draft agreement as it stood. If, therefore, they had the right to introduce amendments into it, I could not see why the Russian Government was deterred from altering the text of the first article so as to leave no doubt as to its meaning, more especially as his Excellency had already clearly explained to them what was meant by the term "Bagdad Railway". M. Sazonov first intended that it was now too late to do this, but on my pressing the point in our conversation his Excellency promised to see whether he could insert the word "jusqu'à" inserted before Bagdad. He did not, however, take any positive engagement to this effect, and the fulfilment of his promise will no doubt depend on the day he acceded to such a suggestion at Berlin.

His Excellency has so far received no communication from the German Government on the subject of the draft agreement.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN



G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 1)

(No. 408.)

Sir,

St. Petersburg, December 26, 1910

ON my entering M. Sazonow's reception-room this afternoon M. Timirazeff was just leaving it, and his Excellency informed me that he had come to report to him the results of his visit to London with regard to the trans-Persian railway scheme.

M. Timirazeff had M. Sazonow had, been very well satisfied with the conversation which he had with various leading politicians and financiers. He had gathered, however, that it was desired in England that the company should be a purely Anglo-Russian one, and that the projected railway should not pass through Tehran, for fear lest the Bagdad Railway should eventually be linked with it when the Sadjei, Kharukin and the Kharukin Tehran lines had been built. As regarded the first of these two points, M. Sazonow remarked that it would, he thought, be almost impossible to prevent the participation of the French in the enterprise, and that it would be very difficult to obtain the necessary concession from the Persian Government were a proposal to be put forward that the British and Russian Governments should have the control of the railway in their respective spheres of influence in Persia. The present world at once suspect that the two Governments were planning a sort of condominium in Persia, and would cite the case of Manchuria, where the railway was controlled by Russia in the north and by Japan in the south.

I told his Excellency that I had no official information as to the views of His Majesty's Government with regard to the details of the scheme, but I repeated to him the language which you had held to Count Benckendorff, as reported in your despatch.

possible danger of its serving as a means of transport for Turkish troops to the Indian frontier.

M. Sazonow replied that he quite understood the reasons which might lead to opposition in India to view the project with an unfavourable eye, but that he

that there were any possible grounds for fearing the second contingency you had drawn attention to. Even when the Sadjei, Kharukin and the Kharukin Tehran railways were built, it would be impossible for the Turks to use the latter line for such a purpose, as it would be virtually under Russian control, while an international railway like the trans-Persian one would be equally closed to them. If, however, His Majesty's Government desired, for either strategical or economical reasons, that the railway should not touch Tehran, it would be always possible to arrange that it should run to the north of that town, through this, again, might lead to difficulties with the Persian Government, who would not really wish that the railway

But in whatever way this question might be settled, it was, in the essential that the railway should be built with the least possible delay, as, were it once in working order, it was quite possible that the Sadjei, Kharukin Tehran lines might

On my observing that there seemed to be considerable opposition to the project in certain quarters in Russia, M. Sazonow said that this was quite true. The Moscow merchants wished to keep the trade in North Persia in their own hands, and were

the Caucasus, German trade with Persia by this route would always be heavily handicapped. Germany had made repeated representations on this score, but the Russian Government had no intention of making any concession with regard to them. They would therefore continue to be enforced on all goods destined for the Persian market, but not on those passing in transit to India. His Excellency admitted, however, that owing to the existence of these dues the Germans would naturally endeavour to introduce their goods into Persia by way of Bagdad, and this fact somewhat weakened his argument that, were the trans-Persian railway to be constructed without delay, the Germans might have to renounce the idea of linking the Bagdad Railway with the North Persian railway system.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN

P.S.—The Minister of Finance, whom I have seen since writing the above, tells me that the trans-Persian railway scheme is to come before the Council of Ministers

this week. His Excellency expressed himself strongly in favour of the opposition to the project.

G. W. B.

21]

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 2, 1911)

(No. 61)

Sir,

Constantinople, December 28, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from the military attaché to this embassy, reporting a conversation with Herr Kuntz regarding the alteration of the track of the Bagdad Railway line so as to pass through Aleppo.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING

I enclose in No. 5.

Major Tyrrell to Mr. Marling.

(No. 74.)

Sir,

Constantinople, December 29, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that I had a conversation to-day with Herr Kuntz, the sub-director of the Bagdad Railway Company. He confirmed the news of a new track via Aleppo, the intention now being to make a sort of V to bring in that town, thereby missing out Tel Habsch, but rejoining the original track east of that as soon as possible. He considers it a foolish procedure, and of no advantage to anybody, as the inhabitants of Aleppo would have been just as well off if connected with the main line by a branch to Tel Habsch as was intended. But he said that the company had reluctantly yielded to pressure exercised through the Government by the clamours of the people of Aleppo, who desired to be on the main line.

The station will be outside the town, and somewhere to the north of it.

He further said that no alteration has recently been made in the track about Adana and that the line will join the Merana-Tarsus line at Yenije, between which place and Adana the trains of the Bagdad Railway will run over the existing Merana-Tarsus Adana line.

I have, &c.

G. E. TYRRELL

Military Attaché

45966

No. 6

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 3.)

A PARAPHRASE of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 16th December, 1910 of which a decypher was sent to the Foreign Office on the 19th December, 1910, is enclosed, with the compliments of the Under-Secretary of State.

India Office, January 2, 1911.



Enclosure in No. 6

The Earl of Crewe to Government of India.

Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, December 16, 1910

RAILWAY across Persia. Please refer to my despatch dated the 4th ult. Russian Government are desirous that there should be no unnecessary delay in discussion of the subject. Please let me have an early reply by mail, giving full expression of Government of India's views.

1623

Cartwright to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 1.)

Vienna, January 4, 1911

WANY and Russia

received information from a most confidential source to the following

A short time before the Potsdam meeting Count Achenthal was notified by the German Government of the principal points to be discussed with M. Sazonov at the Allusion was made at the close of that discussion to the affairs of the and the general belief here at the Ballplatz (according to my informant is Herr von Kinderlen-Wachter, while respecting M. Sazonov in regard to the intentions of Austria-Hungary in the Balkans, also declared that, if (as was improbable) the latter Power should show a wish to disturb the *status quo* in the Near East, she would be held back by Germany.

The above is most confidential

636]

No. 8.

Sir H. Robinson Smith to Sir A. Nicholson.—(Received January 6, 1911)

Dear Sir Arthur,

Constantinople, December 30, 1910

I HAVE to thank you for your letter of the 10th December, in which you told me that M. Pichon is being reminded of the suggestion that proposals for co-operation should now come from the French side, and that Sir Edward Grey does not now deprecate our taking such independent action as our interests may require.

We readily comply with his wish that we should keep the door open for any French proposals; but so far there are no indications that they wish to make any. M. Revail arrived here on the 20th December. We exchanged calls, and I had a fairly long conversation with him.

In the course of the conversation he mentioned the subject of the loan. I said that I did not think that the result could be regarded as satisfactory by any of the parties concerned. He admitted this to some extent, but said it was, in his opinion, not a bad thing that the Germans should have their share in bearing the burden of Turkish finance. I replied that they were already largely interested, and that there was no risk of interference on their part to Turkey's future. M. Revail then said that the present operation would provide for Turkish needs till the end of 1911, but probably not for any longer period. He was optimistic as regards the financial future of Turkey in general.

I expressed my regret at the breakdown of the negotiations for fusion. M. Revail said that he thought there had been some misunderstanding. The London committee had expected us to make further proposals, and we had apparently waited for fresh proposals from them. I said that, even if there had been some slight misunderstanding as regards procedure, that did not alter the main fact, viz., that we found them prepared to contemplate absorption, but not in the least inclined to anything in the

of wishing to reopen the matter

I regretted to find M. Bonapart under the impression that we had on "une concurrence desolée" against the Ottoman Bank. I said that I to remove this impression from M. Bonapart's mind, and had assured him that our competition with the Ottoman Bank was such a fair competition as

acted between banks working in the same place, and was not different in character from the competition which existed between all banks here. M. Revail said that he thought the impression had probably been created by what he might describe as "causes," viz., that friends of the National Bank in the Ministry and where had wished to use the National Bank as a weapon against the Ottoman Bank. He added that, without suggesting anything in the nature of a coalition, he thought that they had a certain solidarity of interest in their

He expressed the hope that the relations between the personally were concerned, would be excellent—a wish, which, I reciprocate

will see from this summary of our conversation, that M. Revail's tone was but that he did not make any suggestion for settling the future relations of the banks. I have heard a report, which I give for what it is worth, that the idea of the Ottoman Bank is to arrange for a large loan which will carry on Turkish lines for more than one year, and in which Paris, Berlin, and London would take part. You will remember the suggestion of a larger loan was said to have been made by the Ottoman Bank at the time when I was in Paris. There is nothing improbable in the I have had no confirmation of it

It is clearly necessary to arrive at a decision soon about the future of the bank. the present position of uncertainty is most inconvenient. Cassel has suggested that I should come to London to take part in the final discussions, and I propose to arrive on or about the 10th January

In order to have all the materials for a decision, I am now endeavouring to obtain from the Government here a clear indication as to their attitude towards the bank

I of the prospects which they can hold out of effective support from the Government the future. I saw the Grand Vizier yesterday, and I enclose a memorandum of our conversation. As you will see, he did not go beyond expressions of general goodwill and assurances that the field was open as regards enterprises of every kind. I shall David Bey to-morrow, and I propose to him more closely as to whether any promise can be given of current Government business

Yours sincerely,

H. HAMBRO & SONS

Enclosure in No. 8

Memorandum of Interview with Hakkı Pasha, Grand Vizier, on December 20, 1910.

I INFORMED Hakkı Pasha that I was leaving for London in a few days, and that it would be necessary to arrive at a decision regarding the future of the National Bank. As he was aware, recent events had raised grave doubts as to whether the bank could, with advantage, continue its operations. The decision of this question would depend, in great measure, upon the prospect of obtaining support from the Government. The bank would never have been

Ottoman Government and the attitude of the British Government had given it expectation of support from both

Hakkı Pasha said that in England there appeared to be a mistaken idea that, because a concession had been given for the Bagdad Railway, the ground was entirely and there was no room for any other enterprises in Turkey. This, he said, was a mistake. The Bagdad Railway was an existing concession. If it were again, it would very likely be arranged in a different fashion, but anyhow, it was, and it could not be revoked. But the Turkish Empire was large, and there was room for very many other enterprises, which were open not only to German capital, but to British capital; and British capital would be heartily welcomed.

I said that I did not think that this erroneous view was held by anyone who was well informed. It was undoubtedly true that the Bagdad question had assumed great importance in the relations between England, Turkey, and Germany, both in itself and also in relation to the position in Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf generally. If the Bagdad question could be settled in a satisfactory manner, I was convinced that it would have an admirable effect on the relations of the three countries

Hakkı Pasha said that the question of Koweit was at the root of the feeling about British action in that part of the world. On this subject he spoke strongly. He said that he regarded it as beyond doubt that British action in relation to Koweit had been unjust. Under British protection, although there was not a



protectorate in the technical sense of the word, Kuwait was the centre of a centralised Arab trade, and a source of continual conflict with its neighbours. As long as this anomalous state of affairs existed, it was impossible to restore peace and order in that part of the world. Kuwait was like a thorn stuck in the side of Turkey and it was British action there, more than anywhere else, that had created suspicion of British aims in Mesopotamia.

I said that I was not acquainted with the details of the question, but whatever its merits or wrongs of the matter His Highness knew perfectly well that British action regarding Kuwait was not directed against Turkey, but against the possibility of Kuwait falling into other hands. The Grand Vizier said that he quite realised this, but that, practically, the action taken by way of defence against the possibility of Kuwait falling into other hands was against Turkey. It was not in any way Turkey's interest or prerogative to permit any other Power to establish itself there. Even under the old regime, Abdul Hamid had not permitted the Germans to acquire a coaling station in the Red Sea. The new regime would be even more strongly opposed to any such acquisition. If there were any doubt as to this, Turkey would be willing to take formal engagements as to the use of Kuwait as a naval station. He said that in his opinion, the matter should be capable of settlement, if there was good-will on both sides, but he complained that he had been unable to obtain a frank and full discussion of the first condition of an understanding.

I said that I was entitled to express an opinion, but that I saw, with great regret, the extreme sensitiveness of Turkish opinion regarding the most innocent and legitimate activities of British shipping and commerce in the Gulf. I referred to a recent article by Ismail Hakki Bahawzade in which the presence of British shipping at Basra, and the extent of British trade there were treated as matters of offence, and in locations of sinister intimation, whereas it was clearly essential to the prosperity of the country to welcome all the shipping and trade that would come, whatever the nations it came from.

Hakki Pasha replied that articles in the press must not be taken too seriously. Ismail Hakki Bahawzade had just returned from Bagdad and Bessora, and had produced more impression on him than anything else was doing.

Grand Vizier then returned to the question of the Bagdad Railway. He said that it must be allowed to complete the line to Bagdad, but that in the meantime, between Baghdad and Basra it was necessary to find some arrangement which would satisfy England. What precise solution was to be preferred he could not say. The Germans had certain demands, and clearly any arrangement must be a matter for negotiation, and it was for the interests concerned to formulate proposals. The Turkish Government would be very anxious to arrive at a settlement, and would be prepared to bring pressure on the Germans with this object. One solution would be to make the line south of Bagdad an international one; another solution would be that it should be a Turkish Government line, a suitable arrangement being made with the interests concerned for providing the capital.

As regards the position of Turkey generally, he said emphatically that, in his view, it was most undesirable to give any one Power an exclusive or preponderant influence in Turkish affairs. He wished to remain on good terms with all the world, and the interests of Turkey lay in securing the assistance of all the Powers equal for her development.

I then spoke again of the position of the bank. I said that so far the bank had received no practical evidence of the Government's desire to support it. No Government accounts had been given to us, and the only semi-official account we had was that of the "Commission de la Flotte". The Constantinople bank had only been arranged after competition with other banks, and after a struggle lasting over several months. I asked whether he could give me any assurances of practical support in the future, which I could lay before our friends in London. Hakki Pasha said that, as regards Government accounts, their hands were tied to a very considerable extent by the terms of the concession of the Ottoman Bank. The Constantinople municipal bank had produced profit sufficient to cover the expenses of the bank for one year at any rate. If the bank had been able to conclude the loan recently under discussion, the profits would have provided for the bank for two or three years at least. Unfortunately, this had been prevented by the action of the British Government, which, he said, speaking quite untheatrical, he could only describe as a blunder. If the British Government did not interpose any bar in future, the National Bank would be able to take part in Government loans, either in co-operation with the Ottoman Bank, or in competition with it. Apart from that, he repeated that the whole of Turkey was open

to foreign enterprise, and that foreign capital would be welcomed. If British capital could come to take part in the development of the country, there would be a profitable field for the bank's energies. He regretted that British capital had taken so little interest in Turkey in recent years, and thought that both the press and commercial circles were not well informed. He referred in this connection to the Mining Law, in the amendment of which the British Government had taken a great interest. The law had been amended, but in the two years which had elapsed since then there had not, so far as he was aware, been a single British application for a

I replied that British capital had had very good reasons for avoiding the country under the old regime, and in order to persuade it to come here now it was necessary to offer adequate inducements and to create the conditions necessary for success. In the case of mines, for instance, the absence of roads and railways made all mines, except the richest, unremunerative. This accounted for the absence of applicants. As regards works of public utility, we found, unfortunately, a certain want of practical sense in the Public Works Department. With the object of securing advantages to the State, concessions were hedged round with impossible conditions. It would be to the real interest of the Government to grant the first concessions on terms which would make them thoroughly remunerative, whereas the conditions now laid down were such that there could not be a large profit, and that there might very likely be no profit at all.

Hakki Pasha admitted that there was truth in what I said, but added that, in his opinion, this difficulty would disappear in time. At the outset of a parliamentary regime there was a tendency to criticise everything. In the endeavour to avert such criticism, the conditions had, perhaps, been drawn too tightly. Experience would remedy these defects.

I asked the Grand Vizier whether they proposed to approve the Bagdad municipal loan. He said that he had been somewhat disappointed as regards the administrative capacities of Nazim Pasha, and that they had doubted whether the money would be satisfactorily spent, if it were granted. He thought, however, that they would come to the decision to support Nazim Pasha still, and in that case they would approve the loan. I represented that it was very desirable to decide the matter as soon as possible, since my letter to Nazim Pasha, resuming our liberty of action in the matter, had probably reached him, or would reach him in a day or two. I added that it might have some influence as regards the future of the bank, if I could point to our business at any rate, though not a large one, which had been concluded. Hakki Pasha said that he would endeavour to hasten the decision.

December 29, 1910

IL. BABINGTON SMITH.

6371

No. 9

Sir H. Babington Smith to Sir A. Nicolson — (Received January 6, 1911.)

(Extract.)

Banque nationale de Turquie, Constantinople  
December 30, 1910.

I SAW the Grand Vizier yesterday, and I enclose a memorandum of our conversation.

Hakki Pasha, in the course of our conversation, dwelt a good deal on the Bagdad question and on the situation in Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf. He stated that the line between Basra and Bagdad should be made as far as possible a Turkish Government line. This is significant in connection with the reports which are current, that negotiations have been begun for the early construction of the line between Heli and Bagdad, and also in connection with the paragraph in Djavid Bey's budget statement, in which he refers to the Bagdad question, and points out that in five years' time, the earliest date at which the line could be completed, the surplus of the debt revenues will probably have increased sufficiently to provide the guarantee as far as Bagdad, and that the Germans, therefore, will lose nothing by abandoning their lien upon the proceeds of the increased customs duties. The Grand Vizier also stated distinctly that it would be necessary to arrive at some arrangement satisfactory to England about the Bagdad and the Gulf, and expressed his readiness to bring pressure to bear, if necessary, in this direction. I do not know whether the



general political situation as regards Germany makes it any more likely now that they would be prepared to come to terms; but it is evident, in the first place, that we have no intention of preventing the German line from reaching Bagdad, and, in the second place, that the situation is more and more acute unless some settlement is reached. Such a settlement would, in itself, improve our relations with the Turks also, and I confess I do not see why we should not at the same time give the Turks some satisfaction regarding Koweit, if we obtain binding engagements regarding its alienation as a "port de guerre".

I will not, however, write more on this subject, as I hope I may have the opportunity of seeing you shortly in London.

#### Enclosure in No. 2.

#### Memorandum of Interview with Hakkı Pasha, Grand Vizier, on December 29, 1910

I INFORMED Hakkı Pasha that I was leaving for London in a few days, and that it would be necessary to arrive at a decision regarding the future of the National Bank. As he was aware, recent events had raised grave doubts as to whether the bank could with advantage continue its operations. This question would depend, in great measure, upon the prospect of obtaining active and practical support from the Government. The bank would never have been started unless the invitation of the Ottoman Government and the attitude of the British Government were taken into account.

Hakkı Pasha said that the mistaken idea that the ground was entirely Turkish. This, he said, was a very common error.

large, and there was room for very many other to German capital, but to British capital; and welcomed.

I said that I did not think that this erroneous view was held by anyone who was well informed. It was undoubtedly true that the Bagdad question had assumed great importance in the relations between England, Turkey, and Germany, both in itself and also in relation to the position in Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf generally. If the Bagdad question could be settled in a satisfactory manner, I was convinced that it would have an admirable effect on the relations of the three countries.

Hakkı Pasha said that the question of Koweit was at the root of the Turkish problem. On this subject he spoke strongly. He said it was beyond doubt that British action in relation to Koweit was under British protection although there was not a protectorate in the sense of the word. Koweit was the centre of the contraband arms traffic, and a source of continual conflict with its neighbours. So long as this anomalous state of affairs existed, it was impossible to restore peace and order in that part of the world. Koweit was like a thorn stuck in the side of Turkey, and it was British action there more than anywhere else that had created suspicion of British aims in Mesopotamia.

I said that I was not acquainted with the details of the question, but whatever the rights or wrongs of the matter, his Highness knew perfectly well that British action regarding Koweit was not directed against Turkey, but against the possibility of German action.

that practically the action taken by way of defence against another Power operated as against Turkey. It was not in any way Turkey's interest or desire to permit any other Power to establish itself there. Even under the old regime, Abdul Hamid had not permitted the Germans to acquire a coaling station in the Red Sea. The new regime

was a naval station. He said that, in his opinion, the matter was one that ought to be capable of settlement if there was good-will on both sides, but he considered

first condition of an understanding.

It is not one in which I was entitled to express an opinion, but that I saw with great regret the extreme sensitiveness of Turkish opinion as regards the most innocent and legitimate activities of British shipping and commerce in the Gulf. I referred to a recent article by Ismail Hakkı Babanzade, in which the presence of British shipping at Bassorah and the extent of British trade there were treated as matters of offence and indications of sinister intentions, whereas it was clearly essential to the prosperity of the country to welcome that could come, whatever the nationality.

Hakkı Pasha said that the Turkish Government would be very anxious to arrive at a settlement, and would be prepared to bring pressure on the Germans with this object. One solution would be to make the line south of Bagdad an international one, another solution would be that it should be a Turkish Government line, a suitable arrangement being made with the interests concerned for providing the capital.

As regards the position of Turkey generally, he said emphatically that, in his view, it was most undesirable to give any one Power an exclusive or preponderant influence in Turkish affairs. He wished to remain on good terms with all Powers, and the interests of Turkey lay in her development.

I then asked him whether the Constantinople loan had been successful in competition with other banks, and after a struggle lasting over several years, whether he could give me any assurance of practical support in the future which I could lay before our friends in London. Hakkı Pasha said that, as regards Government accounts, their hands were tied to a very considerable extent by the terms of the concession of the Ottoman Bank. The Constantinople municipal loan had produced profit sufficient to cover the expenses of the bank for one year at any rate. If the bank had been able to conclude the loan recently under discussion, the profits would have provided for the bank for two or three years at least. Unfortunately, this had been prevented by the action of the British Government, which, he said, spoke of

it interpose any far in future the National Bank would be able to take part in the loan, either in co-operation with the Ottoman Bank or in competition with it.

Apart from that, he repeated that the whole of Turkey was open to foreign enterprise, and that foreign capital would be welcomed. If British capital would come to take part in the development of the country, there would be a profitable field for the bank's energies. He regretted that British capital had taken so little interest in Turkey in recent years, and thought that both the press and commercial circles were to blame. He referred in this connection to the mining law, in the amendment of which the British Government had taken a great interest. The law had been passed in the two years which had elapsed since then there had not, so far as he knew, been a single British

one of mines, for instance, the absence of roads and railways made all mines, except the richest, unremunerative. This accounted for the absence of applicants. As regards

Public Works Department. With the object of securing advantages to the State, concessions were hedged round with impossible conditions. It would be to the real interest of the Government to grant the first concessions on terms which would make them thoroughly remunerative; whereas the conditions now laid down were such that there could not be a large profit, and that there might very likely be no profit at all.



Hakki Pasha admitted that there was truth in what I said, but added that, in his own opinion, this difficulty would disappear in time. At the outset of a parliamentary régime, there was a tendency to criticise everything. In the endeavour to avert such criticism, the conditions had perhaps been drawn too tightly. He said that he would endeavour to hasten the decision.

He thought, however, that they would not be able to reach a decision to support Nazim Pasha still, and in that case they would approve the loan. I represented that it was very desirable to decide the matter as soon as possible since my letter to Nazim Pasha, requesting our liberty of action in the matter, had probably reached him, or would reach him in a day or two. I added that it might have some influence as regards the future of the loans if I could point to one business, at any rate, though not a large one, which had been concluded. Hakki Pasha said that he would endeavour to hasten the decision.

H. BABINGTON SMITH

December 20, 1910

587

No. 10

India Office to Foreign Office — (Received January 6.)

The Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of the Earl of Crewe, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 30th December, relative to the Trans-Persian Railway.

India Office, January 5, 1911

Enclosure in No. 10

The Earl of Crewe to Government of India

India Office, December 20, 1910

Tehran-Ispahan-Yezd-Kerman alignment is now a Russian project, but with a view to "availing the possible risk of intersection at Ispahan with eventual German line," the Russian Government prefer the alignment from Tehran south-east to Kerman. A prospect not hitherto contemplated by us is opened up by the words quoted as to German line. The proposal is that British and Russian interests should predominate, their participation being in equal shares; a settlement to be made by arrangement as to the participation of other nations.

The following is most secret.

The German and Russian Governments are negotiating an agreement in which it is provided—

1. That Bagdad Railway will not be opposed by Russia.

That Tehran and Khamkin will be linked up by Russia after the construction of the lines from Kerman to Bagdad, and from Sadz to Khamkin, and of the North Persian line.

3. That between Bagdad Railway and Persian frontier north of Khamkin no lines will be built by Germany.

1. Special interests of Russia in the north are recognised by Germany, who will ask no concessions in Russian sphere for roads, railways, telegraphs, or navigation.

First clause is understood by Russia, though this is not explicitly stated, to refer to railway as far as Bagdad, and not to hinder Russia from supporting Great Britain in respect of section to the Gulf. Right to construct branch from Khamkin was claimed by Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs in conversation.

construction of North Persian line in near future is or is not intended by Russia, considerable obscurity exists.

1.

[769]

No. 11.

Extract from the "Evening Times" of January 6.—(Received January 7, 1911.)

RUSSIA'S DEAL WITH GERMANY: FULL OFFICIAL TEXT OF THE NEW PROPOSAL

of Persia.

They give Special Rewards for the Recent Loan

OUR St. Petersburg correspondent sends us to-day one of the most important and interesting messages which has been published for a long time—it is the official text of the Russian proposal to Germany with regard to Persia.

This agreement, which was arrived at at a recent conference at Potsdam between the Russian and German Foreign Ministers, puts in an official form Germany's attitude with regard to that country; it also indicates that Russia at last accepts German railway predominance in Turkey in Asia, and, unless there are important reserves, shows that Russia has thrown over her allies in the Triple Entente—Great Britain and France—for it has been always understood that if the Czar's Government made any deal with Germany on the subject it would only do so.

It is stated that Britain was conceded the right of building the railway from Bagdad to Basra, and that Germany secured the right to build a line from Herat, the terminus of the Kabul line, to Bagdad, thus joining up Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean.

Germany has, moreover, secured very important concessions from Turkey for arranging the last loan.

Here is the message—

Own Correspondent

St. Petersburg, January 5, 1911.

The Russian Government has decided to send the exact official text of the proposal put forward by Russia to Germany.

(1)

The Imperial Russian Government declares itself willing not to oppose the realisation of the Bagdad Railway, and undertakes not to place any obstacle in the way of the participation of foreign capital in the undertaking. It is, of course, understood that no sacrifice of a pecuniary or economic nature will be demanded on the part of Russia.

(2)

The Russian Government declares that, in the system of railways in Persia, the Russian Government takes to carry out, when this system shall have been constructed, the building of a line to join on the Turco-Persian frontier, the line from Sadz to Khamkin, when this branch of the Bagdad Railway, as well as the line from Kerman to Bagdad, shall have been finished. The Russian Government reserves the right to fix, at its own choice of time, the final route of the line which shall end and join up at Khamkin.

The two Governments will facilitate international traffic on the latter line, and shall avoid all measures which might hinder it, such as the establishment of transit rights or the application of differential treatment.

(3)

The Russian Government declares that it will not undertake any railway lines in the zone situated between the Bagdad line and the Russian and Persian frontier to the north of Khamkin, nor to lend its material or diplomatic support to any undertakings of the kind in the zone indicated.

[1773]

E

The German Government puts on record that it has no political interests in Persia, and will only pursue commercial aims there, recognising, on the other hand, that it has special interests in the north of Persia from the political, strategic, and economic points of view. The German Government likewise declares that it has no intention of seeking on its own account, or of supporting on behalf of any one amenable to its jurisdiction, or of subjects of other nations, any concessions for railways, roads, navigation, and telegraphs, or any other concessions of a territorial nature to the north of the Afghan frontier at the latitude of Gushik. If the German Government should seek such concessions, it would first come to an understanding with the Russian Government.

On the other hand, the Imperial Russian Government will continue to recognise, with regard to German commerce in Persia, the principle of absolute equality of treatment.

The above document is now under consideration by Germany, which may put forward a counter-proposal although in any case this is not expected seriously to modify the above proposals. In official Russian circles it is held that the document is really Russia's reply to proposals put forward by Germany to the Russian Government in July 1907. It seems that the German Foreign Minister has informed the Russian Foreign Office that Germany is quite confident of securing all the resources necessary for the completion of the line as far as Bagdad, and he claims, moreover, to have the negotiable in France, the Ottoman Bank certainly has subscribed 30 per cent. of the capital of the company, and has sold some of its holdings to French capital while the company also possesses a French vice-president and seven

the Bagdad Railway Company has secured the following extra privileges from the Turkish Government:—

1. The concession of a branch line from Erzurum to Angora.
2. The modification of the first route of the line which constructed straight towards Tel-el-Habesh, will bend to the south to a point 14 kilom. from that city.

The concession of a narrow gauge railway between Aleppo and Alexandretta.

1. The acceptance by Turkey of the German contention according to which excess of titles already allocated to the guarantee of other Turkish railways will in future be assigned not only to the section of the Bagdad line as stipulated in the contract dated the 2nd June, 1903, viz. from Bulgarli to El Heli, but to the entirety of the railway from Koniah to Bagdad.

Great stress should be laid on the latter point, because Great Britain has always strenuously objected to the excess being so employed. The Germans have, however, seemingly carried their point, and Russia has apparently agreed by taking "not to place any obstacles in the way of the participation of foreign in the undertaking."

[848]

No. 12

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 9.)

(No. 14. Secret.)

Sir,

Paris, January 4, 1911.

SIR HENRY BARNINGTON SMITH has been so good as to give me a memorandum (copy enclosed\*) of an interview which he had with the Grand Vizier the 29th ultimo, with the object of enquiring what prospects the Government could be expected to offer for the Bagdad Railway Company continuing to operate in Turkey. Sir Henry has forwarded to Sir Arthur Nicolson a copy of it. I have not yet had time to reply on which I need not therefore dwell, but the point to which I venture now to invite your attention is his Highness's reference to Koweit.

\* Already printed see [636] and [637] Nos. 8 and 9.

What brought the matter to Hakkı Pasha's mind was no doubt Sir Henry's memorandum. It appeared in the "Tanin" of the 25th December, and which was specially devoted to British action in Koweit and British relations with the Sheikh of Muhammerah (see my despatch No. 15 of to-day). Hakkı Pasha had, however, just previously spoken of Koweit, and, after his mention of Koweit, again reverted to it, so that it may be inferred that the Grand Vizier for the moment had, as was suggested in Sir Gerard Lowther's despatch No. 603 of the 29th August last, conceived the idea of making the solution of the two questions interdependent.

It seems probable that the question of Koweit will be raised at no distant date, if indeed it is not, as I email Hakkı Pasha, forced upon us. This latter contingency is, I think, unlikely; but I venture to suggest that it might be well for His Majesty's Government to consider whether in the event of the question being raised, as to discuss the Koweit question it will be more expedient to enter into negotiations or to postpone negotiations for some little time. Looking at the present attitude of the Committee of Union and Progress, which, as you are aware, is the power guiding the affairs of Turkey, postponement would seem the wiser course, in view of the defections from the committee's ranks and its dwindling majorities in the Chamber show that its position is less secure now than a few months ago; there are also signs that Mahmud Shevket Pasha and the senior officers by no means approve the direction given by it to Turkish policy. The lesson learnt by the refusal of the French Government to allow the late loan to be quoted in Paris has had its effect, and that there is a tendency in the committee to modify its chairman, at least, temporarily, is shown by the substitution in the secretaryship of the moderate Hap Adil Bey lately Vah of Adrianople, for the violent Dr. Nazim. Time will, therefore, to all appearances,

that are at work may operate slowly, and in the meanwhile articles such as those of I email Hakkı—not to mention hints which have already appeared in the local press that English intrigues are responsible for the troubles in Koweit—may do us some harm, even in the eyes of those sections of the people who have now no doubts as to the sincerity of our friendship.

Another danger from delay lies in the fact that the Turks desire the Bagdad Railway to be built. It is true that the financial arrangements have only been completed for the construction as far as El Heli, but, as the Grand Vizier implied to me,

found for the annuities for the sections as far as Bagdad. There is even reason to believe that negotiations for the purpose are already on foot, and it is thus probable that although the line cannot actually be built for some years, the Germans may potentially reach Bagdad within a few months, and will be free to turn all their attention and influence to asserting their existing rights under the concession to the Bagdad-Bassorah-Gulf sections. It is not, perhaps, out of place to remark here that by her recent negotiations with Germany Russia appears inclined to disinterest herself in the southern sections of the railway.

In my despatch No. 942 of the 29th ultimo I expressed the opinion that too much importance need not be attached to the advances made by Rifat Pasha as for a renewal of negotiations for a solution of the railway question, but it is quite possible that if that question and that of Koweit were treated together we should find a genuine and effective desire on the part of the Turks to come to an agreement. The prospect of gaining something at Koweit would be a powerful inducement to them to obtain from the Germans the latitude requisite for them to satisfy our requirements in the railway question. It should be remembered that the main object in view when, eleven years ago, we entered into relations with Sheikh Maharak was to prevent the Bagdad Railway from reaching the shores of the Gulf except under conditions consonant with our interests, and I venture to suggest that it is worth while considering whether the moment is not now approaching when we should endeavour to turn our acquired position at Koweit to account, and whether, if we do not now seize the opportunity, we

the Sheikh involving us in particularly thorny questions *vis-à-vis* of the Turks, without having reaped any commensurate advantage. Our position as regards the actual terminus of the railway at Koweit may still be secure owing to the agreement of October 1907, but we might now use the leverage offered to us by the Turkish anxiety to settle the Koweit question to secure our interests on the Bagdad-Bassorah sections; whereas if we do not, and if we allow the line to reach Bassorah under purely German control, it appears to me that a very awkward situation might arise.



tion to us both in Asia and Persia would be immense: nor would the native mind be capable of appreciating the importance of the advantages we should have gained in connection with the railway but would readily credit the Turkish version that we had been compelled to yield to the superior power of the present Government of Turkey. But on the importance of this in relation to our position in the Persian Gulf His Majesty's Government will no doubt take the opinion of the Government of India.

[1131] No. 1

(No. 11)

St. Petersburg, January 10, 1913.

Emperor of Russia himself, the paper obtained the text either at St. Petersburg or at Berlin. It had added to Count <sup>1</sup> ~~ext~~ had certainly not been communicated at the Russian capital. We said that in one or two of the other articles there were a few the text published by the "Evening Times," but it was almost a travesty on words for words of the original document.

[769] No. 11.

(2.17)

NY despatch No. 167, Secret, of 20th April, 1940

1. Branch line from Erzurum to Angora. (This seems unlikely as railway communication via Eskişehir already exists, and such a concession might be deferred.)  
Black Sea Agreement of May 1, 1901.)

2. Modification of main line towards Aleppo
3. Narrow gauge line from Aleppo to Alexandretta
4. Excess of tithes may be allocated not merely to line as far as El Helif, as stipulated in contract dated June 1908, but to line as far as Bagdad.

[1131]

15

No. 15

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan*

A. J. BASTEN

Foreign Office, January 11, 1911

1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 26

Telegram No. 11: Russo-German draft agreement.

I regret that the article as published in the "Evening Times" contains at end of first paragraph article 4 the addition indicated by Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs to your Excellency. As this addition was not in the text enclosed in your despatch No. 48 of 10th December, it is quite conclusive that newspaper had access to information not yet in our possession, and that it must have been obtained through Berlin or St. Petersburg. We will try to ascertain the source, but it is very doubtful if we shall be successful.

1435

No. 16.

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 12.)

(No. 13.)

St. Petersburg, January 12, 1911

RUSSELLMAN negotiations

On consulting the map of Persia this afternoon I noticed for the first time that the line laid down in article 4 of the draft agreement runs in such a way as to cut off a block of a triangular shape near the frontier of Afghanistan lying in the neutral

I asked M. Sazonov why he had made this reference to the neutral zone in the draft agreement, and he replied that he considered it highly important to deter the Germans from seeking concessions for railways in the district in question, he had

M. Sazonow gave me to understand that the words "Intitude of Giluzik" had been inserted by himself. He had not consulted the German Government on this point, and he feared that they might still refuse to accept it.

146569 103

No. 17

Mr. Edward Grey to Mr. Warburg

817.

Porter and Fisher, Journal

I HAVE received your despatch No. 1020 of the 29th ult mo, recording a conversation with the Ottoman Minister for Foreign Affairs on the subject of the Bagdad Railway.

...give your language to Rezaat Pasha, and I have to request you to  
...that, if a detailed scheme is put before His Majesty's Government  
...in regard to the sections of the Bagdad Railway between  
Bagdad and the Persian Gulf, they will be happy to give it their most careful  
consideration.

Law, &c.  
E. G. K. F. Y.

F14423

No. 12.

*Mr. Marham to Sir Edward Grey.*—(Received January 13.)

No. 8.

Constantinople, January 13, 1911.

434

[1778]





[1727]

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. (Received January 16)

(No. 8.)

Sir,

St. Petersburg, January 4, 1911

I ASKED M. Sazonow yesterday whether there was any truth in the statement made by the "Novoe Vremya" a few days ago that the Russian Government was about to make an agreement in reply to the one which the latter had made after the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian agreement, with regard to its attitude towards German interests in the Middle East.

His Excellency replied by inveighing against the editor of the "Novoe Vremya" for having published such a statement and against the "Times" correspondent for having telegraphed him what the editor of that paper had told him without first controlling its accuracy. A correspondent of the "Novoe Vremya," he said, had been at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and had been told, in reply to the enquiry he had made respecting the course of the negotiations, that the project had been sent to Berlin, and he had thereupon published the note. The draft agreement, of which he had then declared, the only answer.

I told that it was M. Sazonow himself who had told the correspondent of the "Novoe Vremya." I must, however, have misunderstood his Excellency, as he told my French colleague to-day that the correspondent had only seen an article in the Press Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

I have, &amp;c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN

1728

No. 21

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. (Received January 16)

(No. 11.)

Sir,

St. Petersburg, January 10, 1911

IN view of the divergent statements which have recently been published in the foreign press respecting the course of the negotiations now proceeding at St. Petersburg for the purpose of incorporating in a diplomatic act the results of the Potsdam conversations, it may perhaps be useful to recapitulate briefly the explanations which have from time to time been given by M. Sazonow with regard to their main points.

On his return from Berlin, M. Sazonow informed Mr. O'Herne that, while Germany had agreed not to seek for any concessions in the Russian sphere, Russia had undertaken that the Bagdad Railway, as far as it was connected at Khanika with the future North Persian railway system. Russia was, however, to have the right to construct the Sahjeh-Khanika line in the event of the Gulf section of the Bagdad Railway being granted to Great Britain. His Excellency further communicated to Mr. O'Herne the assurances which the German Chancellor had given him respecting Germany's future policy in the Near East. At the same time M. Sazonow informed a correspondent of the "Novoe Vremya" of the general tenor of the agreement arrived at with regard to North Persia and the Bagdad Railway, and assured him that no attempt had been made at Potsdam to draw Russia away from her alliance with France and her cordial agreement with England. On my arrival at St. Petersburg a month later, M. Sazonow communicated to me the text of the draft agreement which he had just submitted to Count Pourtales, according to the first article of which Russia engages not to oppose the realisation of the Bagdad Railway. This engagement, his Excellency subsequently explained, had only reference to the railway as far as Bagdad, and not to the whole railway system, including the Gulf section and its other branches.

On the 13th December I drew his Excellency's attention to the statement made by the German Chancellor in the Reichstag a few days previously that an engagement had been taken to the effect that neither of the two Governments would join a combination that might be in any way directed against the other. His Excellency thereupon proceeded to explain that assurances had been exchanged between him and

the German Chancellor to the effect that neither Government had the slightest desire to detach the other from the particular combination of Powers with which it was associated, and that neither of these respective combinations contained any point that was directed against the other. He further informed the French Ambassador on the same day that, though the text of the Chancellor's statement had not been drafted in concert with him, it had been previously submitted to him by the German Ambassador, and that he had raised no objections to its terms.

On the 31st December the "Novoe Vremya" announced that the Russian Government were about to send a note to the German Government in reply to the enquiries which the latter had addressed to them after the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian Agreement respecting their future attitude towards German interests in the Middle East. This note, the "Novoe Vremya" declared, would state that the two Governments had agreed not to take any part in any new combination "with regard to Asiatic affairs" which might be directed against the other. On my questioning M. Sazonow as to the truth of this statement, his Excellency explained that the correspondent of the "Novoe Vremya" had misrepresented what had been told him at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs respecting the negotiations with Germany, and that the draft agreement of which he had given me the text was the only answer which he proposed to return to the German note of 1907. His language to the French Ambassador, who addressed a similar enquiry to him a day or two later, was still more explicit, as his Excellency then declared that no other document, secret or public, had either been prepared or was in course of preparation for communication to the German Government. Finally, on the 7th of this month M. Sazonow informed a correspondent of the "Novoe Vremya" that, as regarded the Potsdam conversations, he could only repeat his former statement which had been published in the "Novoe Vremya" of the 9th November, and that any agreement which might be arrived at between the two Governments would be published *in extenso*.

I have, &amp;c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN.

[1729]

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. (Received January 16)

Secret.

St. Petersburg, January 10, 1911.

ON my calling on the Minister for Foreign Affairs this afternoon his Excellency greeted me by saying that he was very much upset, and that I could probably guess the reason. On my replying in the affirmative, M. Sazonow proceeded to say that he had a favour to ask of His Majesty's Government, namely, that they would endeavour to discover the source from which the "Evening Times" had obtained a copy of the agreement which was being negotiated between him and the German Ambassador. In order to meet the wishes of the German Government he had altered the text of the fourth article of the original draft, and the version of it that had been published in the "Evening Times" was correct. According to its terms Germany was not to demand concessions for railways, &c., in the Russian zone without first coming to an understanding with the Russian Government. This fact was known by no one outside the German and Russian Foreign Offices, not even by the Emperor of Russia himself, and he had therefore told Count Pourtales, who had just been to see him, that, as that was the case, the "Evening Times" could only have obtained its information at Berlin or St. Petersburg, and that it had certainly not done so at the latter capital. On my pointing out one or two discrepancies between the original draft and the published version, M. Sazonow remarked that there were a few inaccuracies in some of the articles, but that, taken as a whole, the document published by the "Evening Times" was a literal translation of the original.

I said that I was sure that His Majesty's Government would be only too glad to render him every assistance in their power, but that I feared that they might have no means at their disposal for ascertaining the truth. It certainly seemed, after what he had told me, that somebody at the Berlin Foreign Office must have been guilty of a great indiscretion. The German Government did occasionally use the English press for the purpose of imparting to the world information which it wished to make public, whether that information were true or false. The report which had been communicated to his Excellency on his arrival at the Russian Embassy at Berlin that His Majesty's

[1773]

Government were on the point of concluding an arrangement with the German Government on the subject of the Bagdad Railway had originated in an article in the "Daily Chronicle," which had evidently been inspired in the Wilhelmstrasse. I should not, moreover, be surprised if the "Daily News" and the "Standard" had their inspiration for their recent articles on the subject of the German Embassy in London. In any case, that the articles in question in no way represented the views of His Majesty's Government, that the papers themselves did not enjoy the reputation which appears to be attributed to them abroad, and that the Russian Government need not entertain the slightest doubt as to the loyal and friendly sentiments of His Majesty's Government. M. Sazonow replied that he never doubted this for a moment, and when the "Reich" had alluded to them, not a single Russian had paid any attention to the article.

Looking later on in the

forth.

Count Potes, M. Sazonow replied

attributed, suggested

At first his Excellency did not seem inclined to inform me of their nature. Subsequently told me that the German Government were anxious to alter the route so as to build Russia to commence the construction of the North Persian Railway as soon as the Sadjeh-Khankin line had been completed. His Excellency explained to me at some length that Count Potes was insisting on assistance from Russia in order to satisfy German public opinion that the Imperial Government was doing all it could to secure an access for German trade to Persia, and seeing that the northern route was closed to it by the transit dues in the

I then enquired what truth there was in the reports which had appeared in the press that the two Governments were about to engage not to enter into any fresh combination of affairs that could in any way be directed against the other.

I the explanation which he had given me as to the meaning of the German Chancellor's statement in the Reichstag with respect to the engagements at Potsdam as regarded such combinations in general, and my immediately preceding despatch, and asked whether it was his intention to record these engagements in the draft agreement. M. Sazonow replied by an emphatic negative, declaring that if the German Government proposed such a course to him he would certainly not consent to it. He still held to the explanations which he had given me on the occasion of the Chancellor's speech. They represented what he held to be the true character of those engagements, but there were certain details connected with the Potsdam visit which he could not confide to me at present. He would, however, communicate to His Majesty's Government when he went, as he hoped to be able to do late in London, and meanwhile he would ask me to reserve my report of what he had just told me for a despatch by messenger, as he did not trust cipher telegrams. I did not like to press his Excellency further, and had therefore to be content with this somewhat vague explanation.

On taking leave of M. Sazonow I mentioned that I had to preside to-morrow at the dinner of the British community at St. Petersburg, and that, in view of all that had been said in the press of late with regard to the Triple Entente, I proposed to include in the course of my speech that Anglo-Russian relations had never been firmer than at the present moment, that the two nations were bound to each other by ties of sympathy and friendship, and that, now we had got to know each other, I was convinced that we should always remain the friends of each other. M. Sazonow replied that he entirely approved of my statement, and that it might have a very good effect at the present moment. He would only ask me to add the word "interests" after "friendship and sympathy," as our common interests were the most important bond of union between us.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN

P.S. January 12.—I only noticed on looking at the map of Persia this afternoon that the line traced in the fourth article of the draft agreement, north of which the Germans are not to ask for concessions, runs for the last section considerably south of the Russian sphere of interest, and thus comprises a triangular block of the neutral zone. As M. Sazonow had never called my attention to this fact, I went to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and asked him to be good enough to explain the reason of including

a reference to the neutral zone in the draft agreement. His Excellency replied that so both in our interest and his own. The Russian Government were particularly anxious that the Germans should not obtain a concession in the portion of territory in question, and unless it was specifically mentioned in the agreement they would be free to do so as in any other portion of the neutral zone. He did not imagine that we should raise any objection to it. I said that, though we had understood that the neutral zone was not to be touched in the present negotiations, I did not personally see any objection, but that, as the matter stood at present, I should have adhered to the original text of the draft agreement.

the words "and in order to overcome his position he had put a full stop after the word "telegraphes" and begun a new sentence, in which the German Government declared that it would not seek for concessions of a territorial nature without the consent of the Russian Government. He rather doubted whether Count Potes would accept even this text, and if he did not the sentence would stop at "telegraphes."

I then enquired whether he expected that the negotiations would continue for any length of time. His Excellency replied that he feared that they would, as, in the first place, the two Governments might wish to change the text completely so as to show that the "Evening Times" version was not the authentic one. I observed that, in that case, I trusted that his Excellency would be able to render the meaning of the first article clear by inserting the words "jusqu'à" before "Bagdad." The Germans, M. Sazonow said, would not be likely to accept this, and though, on my remarking that if the text remained as it stood the whole German press would proclaim to the world that Russia had withdrawn her opposition to the whole Bagdad Railway scheme, his Excellency said he might try to do so, I do not think that there is the slightest chance of his making the attempt. He repeated to me once more his former arguments and former assurances.

I further enquired what were the chief points that had still to be discussed. M. Sazonow replied that article 2 would have to be reconsidered in order to fix the term in which the Tehran-Khankin line should be commenced. He even gave me to understand that the Germans were asking to participate in its construction. It would, he remarked, be a very expensive line to build, and it was being built exclusively in the interests of Germany. As long as Russia retained the control he thought that it would perhaps be more popular in this country were the German Government to consent to its cost.

M. Sazonow told me in the course of our conversation that the Turkish Ambassador had its provisions with regard to the question of railways would be most prejudicial to Turkish interests, and that, if they were persisted in, Turkey would have to modify the terms of the Bagdad Railway concession.

G. W. B.

1858

Mr. Wadsworth

Persa, January 11, 1911

The Potsdam interview has attracted a certain amount of attention in the local press, and the enclosed article in the "Tarn" is a fair sample of the comments it has elicited, which, in the main, have been devoted to insisting on Turkey's right to an interest in Persian affairs. That these interests have been ignored by Germany

Turkey, and it was no doubt on this account that Baron von Marschall was authorized to inform the Porte of the views of the plenipotentiaries at Potsdam.

The "Tarn" also notes that Russia has now practically come to an agreement with the German Government over railway questions in the regions in which she is interested, and that the English press is annoyed at our being left alone in our



opposition to the Bagdad Railway. This observation is due to the republication of an article which appeared recently in the "Daily News," suggesting that Great Britain was dissatisfied with the way in which Russia was fulfilling her engagements under the 1907 convention, and was beginning to repent of her efforts to maintain intimate relations

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING

Encl sure in No

Extract from the "Times" of January 16, 1911

THE AMERICAN PRESS

THE LATTER information concerns the fact that Russia was to build the Bagdad-Khankin railway section was absurd, and that an agreement merely treated of the junction to be effected between the Bagdad Railway and a line to be constructed by Russia in Persia. The matter now becomes clear and reasonable. It is wished that the German Government for the sake of our amity proper, had admitted to this purely economic discussion those entitled to admission on purely economic grounds; that it had exchanged views, for instance, with the Ottoman Bagdad Company, or with the mixed or international company which proposes to build the Persian line. In that case the railway would have been separated from politics, and our confidence would have been increased.

From the satisfactory information we have received, we can say that Germany is confident enough to communicate to the Sublime Porte the gist of the economic discussion about the Khankin line. Its omission to inform our Ambassador at Berlin at the same time is a detail, and we see no necessity to insist upon it.

It is not only the Khankin question which affects us. European statesmen must realize that all Persian affairs have a very keen interest for Turkey. Why is it, Russia, when she wants to get *carte blanche*, thinks it necessary to approach Germany, who is several thousand miles from Tabriz, while we, who have a common frontier with Persia for the space of 1,000 miles, if we did not take so broad a view of the Persian question, why should it not be considered as important to discuss the Khankin line with Ottoman diplomatists as with it?

While not leaving the economic sphere, Germany is following an important policy in this matter. She is obtaining the consent of one of the Powers who for long have been opposed to the completion of the Bagdad Railway. Russia leaves the other opponent, England, practically alone in her obstruction, and she sacrifices this for a proposed Persian railway which may never come into being. She gives up present advantage for a future, imaginary profit; and that is why the English press is angry and is accusing Russia of not playing the game.

As far as the German point of view and the Bagdad Railway are concerned, there is no need for Turkey to exert herself about the Potsdam meeting. We must follow the policy pursued with regard to Persia generally is for us a question of life and death. There is no country whose common frontier with Persia is as long as ours, there is no country with whose people we are so closely bound. Therefore Turkey must have a voice in Persian affairs. Neglect touches the very heart of our country. We do not think that the present strength of our country will allow us to be content with this policy of neglect, and it is as necessary for the other party to make explanations and communications to the Sublime Porte as it was for Germany to make them. We are justified in expecting the communications which courtesy and friendship alike demand.—(Small Hack)

1774

No. 2

Letter to Sir Edward Grey—(Received January 16)

Munich, January 16, 1911

You have doubtless been informed from other sources of the discussion mentioned in the German press by the Chancellor's speech in the Reichstag on the 10th December with reference to the "Potsdam interview" and the comments thereon in the French and English newspapers.

The subject was worn almost threadbare before I arrived in Munich, and I have

not thought it worth while hitherto to trouble you with any remarks upon it.

It is, however, of the "Münchener Neueste Nachrichten" contains a communication from its correspondent at Berlin which bears indication of being officially inspired, and may be fairly taken to indicate the view which the German Government would wish the public to take of the results of the now famous interview, especially as regards its effect on their relations with Great Britain.

After some disabliging remarks respecting the attitude of the English, French, and Russian papers, and favourably comparing M. Sazonov's character as a statesman with that of his predecessor M. Lvovsky, the writer of the article goes on to say that it is to be wondered at that the standpoint of Russia in these negotiations has not been fully grasped by Russian diplomatists abroad or by the Chanceries of London and Paris. The latter have sought to prove that the results of the Potsdam interview exaggerated, and that both the Franco-Russian alliance and the Triple Entente remained unshaken. On the part of Germany these facts have never been contested but it is indeed true that Germany and Russia have come to an understanding on various questions, with the firm determination on both sides that neither Power should enter into any combination which is aimed against the other. If however, out of a long list of questions the affairs of Persia and the Bagdad Railway contract have been singled out for special comment by the foreign press it can only be because the idea that Russia should come to an independent understanding with Germany on these points is disliked in London, notwithstanding that not so long ago a united advance of the three Powers was planned. Russia is dealing at this juncture solely in the interests of her own commercial and political plans, and these interests happen to correspond exactly with those of Germany. But Germany is naturally also always ready to enter into an understanding with England in regard to the Bagdad Railway, though obviously not on the basis of the pretensions categorically put forward by the "Daily Telegraph." To begin with, it may be observed that they would never be accepted by Turkey, for it must not be forgotten that the Bagdad Railway is a Turkish enterprise, carried out for the most part with German money, and that the Turkish Government, conscious of its own interests will never hand over the important head section of the line to England.

Many other possibilities are, however, conceivable, and it is to be hoped that London and Berlin have agreed—according to the statement of the 10th December forthwith to enter on an amicable discussion of their respective interests, it may be hoped that here too a way may be found to bring about a solution.

VINCENT

2068

Sir Edward Grey to Sir H. Ross

Foreign Office, January 16, 1911

The Italian Ambassador asked me to-day about the Russo-German negotiations at Potsdam.

I said that we heard from St. Petersburg that these negotiations had made no change in the orientation of Russian policy, and I considered that nothing had happened that implied a regrouping of the European Powers, or that would impair our cordial relations with Russia.

The Ambassador enquired whether I was quite satisfied with regard to the Bagdad Railway.

I replied that the Bagdad Railway was only one thing, and it must not be regarded

1774

1.

to the Bagdad Railway was, I hoped, the first step towards a general solution of the problem, and a solution was much to be desired.

The Ambassador then told me that he had sent to his Government a report on an article which had appeared in the "Daily News" recently on the subject of *ententes* with Russia and France, and which had excited much comment.

I said that the article had been brought to my notice. It did not seem to me to be very fortunately worded. It was certainly not inspired, nor did it represent the foreign policy of the Government. As a matter of fact the "Daily News" and some other newspapers on the Liberal side were

cerament. It was quite true that our impression that we were prepared to sacrifice some of our friends or France in order to improve our relations with Germany. That we would never do

Ambassador said that if Germany approached us on minor points of difficulty he supposed there would be no lack of disposition here to meet her.

I replied that we certainly wished to be on the best of terms with Germany ourselves, and rejoiced to see France and Germany and Germany and Russia on good terms. If Germany acted in good faith she could have the best relations with every Power in Europe. Difficulty had been caused in the past by what I called the "drag" of the Bismarckian policy, the making of mischief

long of the mind of one against another. But I did not say that this was

I am, &c  
E. GREY

1958.

Sir Edward Grey to Mr. Marling

(1)  
circular, P.

Foreign Office, January 17, 1911

IN December last the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs expressed a desire to discuss with us the question of the Bagdad Railway. His Excellency stated he was for the solution of the question. If, therefore, he refers to the subject, we should say that any proposals which the Porte has to make will at the careful attention of His Majesty's Government. I do not want to be able to say that it is our unwillingness to discuss the question which prevents progress being made. I recommend to your notice as of use in this connection memorandum of the 29th July 1910, concerning the Minister of F.

2081.

No. 30

Sir Edward Grey to Sir P. Bertie

No. 28. Secret  
Sir,

Foreign Office, January 18, 1911

I GAVE M. Cambon to-day, verbally, the substance of my conversation with Count Henckendorff yesterday, omitting any reference to the del. Tehran-Khankin branch

Persia

M. Cambon took the same view as I did at St. Petersburg with regard to the Bagdad Railway over necessity that France and we should keep in c

I concurred in this. M. Cambon added that M. Sazonov had informed the French Ambassador in St. Petersburg that, owing to the publication of the draft agreement, the draft would have to be set aside, and some time would be required to arrange matters. M. Cambon understood that M. Sazonov had said to Sir George Buchanan not only that time would be required, but that in the course of further discussion the arrangement with Germany might have to be extended, so as to embrace more than was comprised in the negotiations at Potsdam.

I added that M. Sazonov had said that only what related to the Bagdad Railway would be put in writing, and that whatever else there might be would not be in writing.

I then told M. Cambon that, if we received a proposal as to the Bagdad Railway from either Germany or Turkey, we would try to get the best possible terms in with the section from Bagdad to the Gulf. But we would not make an arrangement without consulting the French Government and keeping in them.

M. Cambon asked me what arrangement would be possible, for he understood that we had told Djavid Bey that we could not agree to the conversion of the Gulf section into a Turkish railway.

On the contrary, we had told Djavid Bey that if the Gulf section of the railway was to be constructed, the Turks would employ British engineers, materials &c., an arrangement might be possible. As to Kowit, if the Turks would guarantee the *status quo* of the sheikh's position we would recognise Turkish suzerainty over the whole district.

The information that we were prepared to recognise Turkish suzerainty over the Gulf was new to M. Cambon. He said that a Turkish railway made by Turkish engineers and British materials, with a British director, and a harbour managed by us, seemed to offer a possible solution.

I asked him what France would require.

He answered that the Bagdad-Homs line would be of no use until Mesopotamia was reached, however, ask for the preference in the north. This he regarded as a rather note contingency. France would also ask for the junction of the Aleppo line with the Bagdad Railway; for the Samarra-Sivas line, and perhaps also some small railway in the north. After all that had passed, Russia ought to agree to this.

I said that in any case we must be guided by the Russian position. M. Sazonov held to his position with regard to the 1 per cent. increase in the Turkish interest, pressed upon M. Cambon that I did not wish to try to upset the arrangement which Russia had made with Germany. I wished M. Sazonov to make the best of it. If it were upset there would be a great deal of friction, and no one could say how far the consequences might extend.

M. Cambon said that we must look upon what had been done as a loss to be written off.

I am, &c  
E. GREY

49

No. 31

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, January 18, 1911

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 497, Secret, of the 26th ultimo, reporting a conversation with the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs relative to the draft agreement respecting Persia and the Bagdad Railway which has been submitted by his Excellency to the

I approve the language used by your Excellency to M. Sazonov on that occasion.

I am, &c  
E. GREY

1628.

No. 32

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, January 18, 1911.

I HAVE received your Excellency's telegram No. 15, Secret, of the 14th instant, reporting your conversation with the Emperor of Russia on the occasion of the reception of the diplomatic body by His Imperial Majesty on the Russian New Year's Day.

The language used by your Excellency to His Imperial Majesty has my entire approval.

I am, &c  
E. GREY



Letter from Sir G. Buchanan

Count Benckendorff today a short note

together with the Russian rebellion

It had been that each of us might negotiate separately with

it would be well for

must closely

that Germany did wish to get from Russia, and the fact that Germany had

the railway was in  
Turkish customs and

connection at Kankon

I did not think I

and I do not

to remain in

another point on which I wished to comment. I gathered from what  
M. Sazonow had said that Germany might press for participation  
in the Black Sea branch. It would be a very serious matter if Germany

it be used to the

Constantinople M

d by Pan-Islamism, but it might be

It was therefore most important that Russia

Further I observed that the Russian Government was so rigidly that he would  
not discuss the neutral zone in Persia without first consulting us  
part of it into his negotiations with Germany

with regard to this point

that as part of the neutral zone in Persia dealt with in the agreement this

an embarrassment to Russia if we asked for her co-operation  
concerning the

id to Count Benckendorff that I made these criticisms on 1

Potsdam, I wished it to be clearly understood that I did not

them as affecting the general relations between Russia

remains as far as I was concerned as cordial and intimate as ever. Nor did I wish  
to be taken out of the arrangement which she had made, that would make her

relations with Germany worse than before, and it would suit neither Russia nor us that  
Russia should be on bad terms with Germany. What I did wish was that Russia should  
be on her guard respecting the points to which I had called attention.  
I also told Count Benckendorff that we must now as opportunity occurred make  
terms we could with Germany or Turkey as to the section of the railway from  
the Gulf. It was most important that M. Sazonow should keep in view  
the question of the 4 per cent. increase of Turkish customs dues, so that we might  
be on this point. I was very glad to hear what Count Benckendorff  
said, and to learn from him how clear M. Sazonow's view with regard

I am &c  
E. G. L.

2243

Letter from Sir Edward Grey—dated January 20

Paris, January 19, 1911

At an interview which I had with M. Poincaré yesterday I congratulated him  
on his speech in the debate in the Chamber of Deputies on the Foreign  
Affairs. He said that it was necessary to gloss over the proceedings of  
Sazonow at Berlin. In his anxiety to obtain some advantage for Russia the latter  
I neglected to comment on as he ought to have done, with the French and British  
governments in regard to the Bagdad Railway question, and he had tied his hands in

I referred to the dissatisfaction which had been shown by the Turkish press at the  
comment between Russia and Germany, and M. Poincaré said that he was not entirely  
satisfied with that dissatisfaction for when Nispet Pasha, the Turkish Ambassador  
in London, had expressed what he knew concerning the Potsdam interview, he had  
said that all he could tell him was that they had dealt with Persia and that it was  
not to be supposed that M. Sazonow had acceded to German desires in regard to  
Persia without some compensatory advantages which perhaps might not be consistent  
with the interests of other Powers. It would be for the Porte to consider what they  
ought to do.

M. Poincaré further told me that, having heard that there might be modifications  
in the Russo-German agreement he had plainly told the Russian Ambassador that in  
such event, and in any future cases in which French interests are involved, the French  
Government expects to be consulted and kept informed by the Russian Government.

I have &c

FRANCIS DE RUDE

[2350]

No. 35.

Letter from Sir Edward Grey—dated January 21

No. 6. Constantinople

Telegramme: P

Vienna, January 20, 1911

I UNDERSTAND that the articles on the Potsdam interview which have been  
published by the "Lantern" newspaper at Constantinople have aroused some uneasiness  
here. It appears that there is a tendency here  
to attribute to Germany (to attribute to Anglo-French intrigues the inspiration  
article. There is I am told, an inclination existing in the Ballplatz, or  
quarters of it, to make the matter before long the subject of articles in the press  
though up to the present there has been nothing of the kind published. It is expected  
that Count Achrenthal, who is now absent, will spend a few days here in the course of  
next week, when I shall hope to see him.

I have received the information contained in this telegram from a private and  
confidential source.

Sir E. Grey will be obliged if the Earl of Crowe will favour him with his observations on the points raised in this letter.

I am, &c.  
LOUIS MALL.

difficulty in reconciling his Excellency's language to me on my first arrival here with these fresh concessions to Germany. On my arrival he gave me to understand that his consent to the denunciation of Germany with regard to the Bagdad Railway was only given in order to obtain from Germany an assurance of a railway to the north of the Persian and Russian frontiers, and by the fact that it was essential for Russia to avert any possibility of Germany securing the concession for the railway from Karsukin to Tehran. It now looks as if he was only supposed to have won at the time, but he has been about six months, unless, indeed, he has succeeded in obtaining some *quid pro quo* of which we are kept in ignorance.

No. 15.)  
S r.

Berlin, January 14, 1911.

IN his weekly review of international politics, Professor Schömann devotes a paragraph to the Potsdam conversations and the subsequent negotiations between the German and Russian Governments. He says that nothing authentic is known of the Russo-German agreement beyond what was stated by the Chancellor in the Reichstag with the consent and approval of the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs. Everything else was apocryphal, even though the alleged text of the agreement published in the "Times" [*sic*] might be not far from the truth. He adds that this publication is probably only the rough draft of an agreement which, through an astounding indiscretion, came into the possession of the great city organ from the Russian Foreign Office, but that the text cannot possibly be correct, as the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs has stated publicly that the negotiations are still in progress, and that on their



conclusion the full text of any agreement which may be arranged will be published. Professor Schiemann then makes the following remarks —

"However this may be, one fact remains fully established, namely that Germany will support no attack on Russia, by whomsoever made, and that it will take part in no aggressive action against Germany. If, the as is stated, neither affects nor weakens either the Russo-French Alliance or the Russian *Entente*, it follows, by irrefutable logic, that by was Russia bound to support any agreement between other Powers. It would, however,

maintained that the Russian alliance was to serve France in every possible circumstances, while in certain quarters it was found advantageous to attribute the same wide range to the conversations at Reval. Before M. Sazonov's true Russian statement saw no necessity to contradict this fraudulent error, and on their shoulders must lie the responsibility for the anxiety with regard to the possible outbreak of a great European war which has for so long disturbed the public mind. The two Emperors and the leading statesmen of Russia and Germany have now found it more useful to explode this fiction and let the truth be known, and in taking this course they have rendered eminent service to the peace of the world. The sorry efforts to draw a veil over the truth which have recently been noticeable, first in M. Lavolsky's speech to M. Edmures and then in innumerable articles in the French, English and Russian press, have therefore signally failed without altering the fact that a definite alliance exists between Russia and Germany.

As regards the article of the 8th April, 1904, any paragraph of a threatening character directed against Germany, is not known, it seems, however, unlikely."

Another well-known publicist, Count Reventlow, has an article this week especially the Bagdad Railway.

In this article he begins by observing that now that even in France people are inclined to realize, though perhaps somewhat against the grain, that the German agreement has strictly followed the lines indicated by the German Chancellor, the Reichstag, British public opinion has been the corner-stone of British policy and designs in the Middle East. The Bagdad Railway in its relation to the Persian Gulf and Persia.

As regards the latter country, Count Reventlow expresses the opinion that, under present circumstances, the Anglo-Russian agreement, which divided Persia into three zones—Russian, British, and neutral—can not remain much longer in its present form, and that with the advent of a more orderly state of affairs in Persia and with the growth of commerce and means of communication in the interior, its conditions must necessarily be relaxed. He argues that the British zone, created as such for political and strategical reasons, although the smallest and least important both as regards population and fertility, nevertheless contains the most important roads. That, on the other hand, the neutral zone which touches the Persian Gulf, contains the towns of Bushire and Bandar Abbas, and includes the fertile and commercially valuable territory served by the caravan roads which connect the Russian zone with the Persian Gulf. He adds that the Persian Gulf itself is completely in the hands of the English, and that the latter have a complete monopoly over the roads in and that therefore the middle zone of Persia is practically anything but a neutral zone.

He then points out that although His Majesty's Government have deference to European public opinion modified their threat to "take into their own hands" the protection of the roads, the fact remains unchanged that the efforts of Great Britain are directed towards obtaining a commercial monopoly of the roads of Middle Persia, and thus dominate the trade of North Persia with the Persian Gulf as the basis of her operations. He then contrasts this policy, which he declares to be in direct contradiction to the principle of the "open door," with that of Russia, who, as regards her zone of influence, has given the required guarantees that that principle will be upheld. He then says:

"In the present state of railway construction in Persia and Turkey, Great Britain is able by means of her predominant position in the Persian Gulf to exercise a commercial influence over North Persia, and both a commercial and political influence over Middle Persia, a result which is entirely at variance with her arrangements with other Powers, and which distinctly clashes with the latter's interests. The consequence

of her policy is, and must infallibly be, an increased and increasing solidarity between Germany and Russia in North Persia. Great Britain's position in Persia has accordingly been modified by the Russo-German agreement, a fact which explains the rumours which have been started, to the effect that negotiations are about to take place between Germany and Russia for an understanding as regards Persia. As was recently stated from the German side, and probably with truth, no such negotiations have yet taken place; but that does not make it any less probable that Great Britain is desirous of coming to an understanding with Germany, not only as regards the comparatively unimportant Persian question, but more especially as regards the Bagdad Railway."

After pointing out that the Russo-German agreement has rendered it highly probable that the Bagdad Railway will be completed in about five years from now, he mentions that an idea has been started in England and supported in Germany that the southern section of the line, from Bagdad to the Persian Gulf, should be under British control, and he adds that this proposal is highly regarded in England as the only natural and present solution of the Persian Gulf question, and the only one which can be discovered by the German Government.

He then enters into a long dissertation on what he calls Larzen's glacial theory respecting the defence of India, which he observes could only be carried out if the whole world were British.

He then points out that even if, as seems probable, the Bagdad Railway is carried to the Persian Gulf without any British participation, it will in any case not be under British control. The harbour chosen, will be, not a German, but a Turkish harbour. He adds that neither the construction of the line by Germany nor its ultimate possession by Turkey have any political bearing on the Persian or Persian Gulf questions, it is a matter to both land and sea trade, and as such it should be left to the Turkish Government whose proud boast it is that she is ever the pioneer of commerce, culture, and civilization.

Instead of this, we hear the demand from England that the terminal of the Bagdad Railway must be British, and that the southern section of the line must be under British control! In other words, Great Britain, hitherto the loudest upholder of the *status quo* in Turkey, proposes to annex the purely commercial undertaking of the Ottoman Empire. It is the plain duty of all the Powers interested in the territorial development of Turkey to prevent the realization of Great Britain's designs, while Turkey, on her side, who must be fully aware of the consequences of such designs, must also put her shoulder to the wheel and make it perfectly plain to the world that the Bagdad Railway from beginning to end is in every sense Ottoman property."

He then gives a full account of Count Reventlow's article, and says that the present moment being held by the entire German press. It is impossible not to compare this language with the declarations so often reiterated by German statesmen that the Bagdad Railway is a purely German undertaking, and one which not only concerns the German financial houses who secured the concession, but one which has in the eyes of public opinion assumed the character of a great German national idea. It is also noteworthy that the present language should be so universally held so soon after the German Government has been discussing with that of Russia, and without, as is stated, any previous consultation with Turkey, plans for the construction of railways on Ottoman territory. The explanation is, I presume, to be found in the telegrams which have been received from Constantinople.

He then says that the German Government has not been informed by the Russian Government of what was passing between them. The *Zeitung*, which publishes this telegram, says, of course, that the interest it is to sow dissensions between that country and Germany, and after stating that the German Government has not been informed by the Russian Government of what was passing between them.

He then says that the German Government has not been informed by the Russian Government of what was passing between them. The *Zeitung*, which publishes this telegram, says, of course, that the interest it is to sow dissensions between that country and Germany, and after stating that the German Government has not been informed by the Russian Government of what was passing between them.

that the only result of the Russo-German negotiations as yet known is that Russia proposes to withdraw her opposition to the completion of the Bagdad Railway, and to the building of a branch line to the Persian frontier, points out that the withdrawal of opposition is a distinct gain and in no way a disadvantage to Turkey.

The article endeavours to console Turkey by observing that as yet the negotiations have not gone beyond the stage of "proposals," and that the mere fact that Germany is a sure guarantee that Turkish interests will not suffer, as in which Germany has handled the Cretan question.

"sische" points out, and here its argument is somewhat difficult to follow, that as the German and Russian Governments have promised to publish the result of their negotiations as soon as they have been consolidated into a definite agreement, there is no ground for any feeling on the part of the Turks that they should have been consulted beforehand or that their interests are being threatened.

I have, &

W. E. GOSCHEN

24891

No. 39.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey. (Received January 23.)

(No. 49. Confidential.)

Constantinople January 17, 1911

I have the honour to report that the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs yesterday that the communiqué published in the "Evening Times" of which I reported in my telegram No. 10 is an accurate version of the assurances given by the German Ambassador as to the scope of the negotiations in progress between Germany and Russia as a result of the meeting of the Kaiser and Tsar at Potsdam. He said that the Turkish Government had been very much disturbed by the publication of the "Evening Times," but that the explanations received from Baron von Marschall had quite relieved them of their first suspicions that Germany had been carrying on independent negotiations with a third Power on matters of vital concern to Turkey, and had acted in a manner derogatory to her dignity as an independent Power.

I observed that one of the points in the agreement as reported by the "Evening Times" was to the effect that Germany undertook not to construct railways in Asia Minor in the vicinity of the Persian frontier to the north of Kermanshah. I take it from his Excellency that Baron von Marschall's explanation of this? Ribiat Pasha replied that I might certainly do so, for, as a matter of fact, the Ambassador's explanations amount to a declaration that the discussion between the two Powers had been limited to two points, viz., the recognition by Russia of the policy of the open door in Persia, and an undertaking by her for the eventual linking up of the Persian railway system with the Bagdad Railway.

I am not, of course, aware what were the exact words used by the Ambassador to convey this impression to the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, but he has certainly shown remarkable skill in working it, even if, when taken strictly *au pied de la lettre*, it contained nothing in flagrant contradiction with the actual facts as communicated to His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg by M. Sazonov. If, however, Baron von Marschall had to make out the best case he could without saying too much to mere curiosity, Ribiat Pasha on his side was equally, if not perhaps more, interested in appearing to accept his explanation. Otherwise he would not have blanked the obvious criticism of the German explanations, viz., that apparently Russia was to get an *quid pro quo* for the concessions, which, according to Baron von Marschall's statements, she was making to Germany. But the truth is that the present Cabinet has so far committed itself, under the pressure of the Salon Committee influences, to a policy of rapprochement with Germany, that for it now to cavil at or show mistrust of the lame and tardy explanations which the revelations of the "Evening Times" have forced the German Government to concoct would be a confession of error, of which the Opposition would make considerable capital. The German Ambassador must feel that he is walking on very thin ice, and it will be interesting to note how he will extricate his Government from the much more embarrassing situation which would result if an authoritative statement of the real facts, which M. Sazonov is stated to have promised, is given to the public. Meanwhile, the Turkish Foreign Office has to profess itself to be entirely satisfied, and the

committee press labours hard to blind the Turkish public to the real facts. The

attitude of the "Tanin" are particularly significant. On the 11th inst. it had accepted the statements of the "Evening Times" as correct, for, with suppressed irritation on Germany's neglect to consult Turkey as to the negotiations, he argues that the chief blame must after all attach to Russia, whose interests are chiefly served by the concessions made by Germany in Turkey. Two days later the "Tanin" only consents to discuss the question in the light of the German Chancellor's statements, from which, however, in only half-concealed comfort is drawn, while by the 16th the nimble pen of its editor is able to say that the explanation has served to allay the suspicions aroused by the

English press, while a statement made in the "Daily Telegraph" that England had agreed that the Bagdad Railway should terminate at an English port on the Persian Gulf is adroitly made use of to insinuate that Baron Marschall's statement is a mere device to deceive the public of Great Britain. With equal ingenuity France is proved to be only less culpable than ourselves.

It was unfortunate that the "Times," in spite of the objectlessness of its experience to which its attention was specially called by its correspondent published in the same issue, should at this moment have published a leading article, while discussing the prospects of negotiations on the Bagdad Railway with there is not even a suggestion of the necessity of any reference to Turkey (12th January). The opening was not lost on Hussein Jalid, who, on the 17th inst., with commendable accuracy the substance of the "Times" remarks, concluded with the following:

"There is no mention of us. It is as though we were not there. The British Government or rulers of part of the Persian Gulf. In view of this open neglect of our rights, the German assurances not to enter into negotiations without the knowledge of the Ottoman Government naturally take on a smaller colour in our eyes. England may have great interests in the Persian Gulf, when spoken of in this English interests cause us no apprehension, but if English interests are put forward when an Ottoman railway is under discussion, there comes involuntarily the question whether those interests are to be sought in detriment to the Ottomans. Anyhow, these discussions show that the construction of the Bagdad Railway is a vital question for us. Let us once get to Bagdad, and the question will take on a different aspect."

of silence against Turkey between the four Powers, of course Germany bears the smallest share of responsibility, and the only is taken by one or two papers to jeer at the inefficiency of Turkish officials and of the Foreign Minister.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that the Russian charge d'affaires has told me with some little acerbity that the German Ambassador had not consulted him before making his explanations to the Porte, and, indeed, had never even mentioned the subject of the Persian discussions to him.

I have, &

CHARLES M. MARLING

24901

No. 40.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey. (Received January 23.)

No. 50. Secret.)

Constantinople, January 17, 1911

Sir, In my despatches Nos. 14 and 15 of the 14th January I had the honour to submit some remarks on Young Turkey's views as to the policy to be pursued in Southern Mesopotamia, and on the connection in the Turkish mind between the settlement of the Koweit question and the arrangements for completing the terminal section of the Bagdad Railway.

I notice by the Government of India's telegram of the 1st December, enclosed in the India Office's letter of the 9th December, 1910, that the resident at Bushire



advocates the necessity "from the local standpoint" of publishing our agreement with Koweit and intimating to the Turkish Government our intention of making it while also eliminating the anomaly of the Turkish flag there. We confine ourselves to Katif and Uqair, and bringing about their withdrawal from El Bida'a, Jinnah, Unkast, and Babujan.

I would venture to submit that, for the reasons in part set forth in my despatch No. 14 of the 4th January, the time has not yet come for such a drastic treatment of our outstanding difficulties with the Turks at the head of the Persian Gulf. As pointed out in Sir Gerard Lowther's No. 603 of the 22nd August, 1910, and in the 1st of the 4th instant, the Turks expect that in return for their making the arrangements concerning the Bagdad-Persian Gulf section of the railway, we shall restore them to complete sovereignty over Koweit. They attach immense importance to the latter point, and, should it ever be deemed expedient to accede to it in this matter, such a solution might be made dependent on their resigning the Bazarin, El Kutr, and everything south-east of Uqair. The oil-bargaining are the "Comet" and the Sepoy guard at the Bagdad consulate-general. But as long as Turkish constitutions are a mere travesty of popular institutions and as associated mainly with the state of siege and secret court-martials, any settlement on the above lines, implying as it would the delivery of Koweit to the tender mercies of committee regime, would seem to be exact.

Should the committee eventually prove unable to establish an orderly Government and the Empire be brought to a state of anarchy, as in Persia, it might become necessary to consider the expediency of openly proclaiming a protectorate over Koweit and its dependencies, but, in the meantime any whisper of our intention to adopt such a course would raise a fierce storm both here and in Central Europe. A recent report in the "Daily Telegraph," which reached here through the "Times," to the effect that England was about to conclude an arrangement that the Bagdad Railway should terminate at an "English port" in the Gulf, drew forth very angry remarks in the "Taman." The writer concludes his comments by stating that it is imperative to warn those who are working to establish foreign influence in Mesopotamia, "the oldest and most attached province of the Empire," that their schemes are vain and that "the mention of an English port in the Gulf would be established to the detriment of Ottoman interests and territorial integrity, is the height of imbecility."

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING

24911

No. 41

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey (Received January 17)

(No. 51. Confidential.)

Sir,

Pera, January 17, 1911

With reference to my despatch No. 920 of the 29th ultimo, I have the honour to report that the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs yesterday again referred to the question of the Bagdad Railway, and stated that the Ottoman Ambassador in London would be very shortly furnished with instructions to approach you on the subject. His Excellency was, however, still unable to give me any details of the proposals which Tewfik Pasha was to lay before you.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING

1953

No. 42

India Office to Foreign Office, (Received January 23)

A PARAPHRASE of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 14th January, of which a decypher was sent to the Foreign Office on the 17th January, is enclosed, with the compliments of the Under-Secretary of State.

India Office, January 21, 1911

37

Enclosure in No. 42

The Earl of Creve to Government of India

India Office, January 14, 1911

See my telegram dated the 30th ultimo. The sphere is made to run from Kakh to the frontier of Afghanistan at the latitude of Giazik, for purposes of article 4 of agreement between Germany and Russia, and a modification has been made in the agreement, to the effect that concessions in Russian sphere will not be sought by Germany without an understanding with Russia being first arrived at. Practically, the result is to hand over to Russia whole of neutral section of frontier of Afghanistan. Admission on the part of Russia that Germany has an unlimited right to seek concessions in remainder of neutral zone may also be read into agreement. I shall be glad to learn your views as to how our position is affected by this. Admission of Germany to participation in line from Khanikin to Tehran is apparently contemplated by Russian Government. I am, Sir, very respectfully,  
about Bagdad Railway

28891

No. 43.

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey (Received January 24)

St. Petersburg, January 24, 1911

My telegram No. 18 of the 22nd January

In a conversation which I had with M. Sazonow last night I took the opportunity of impressing upon his Excellency how important it was that Russia should keep the absolute control of the line from Khanikin to Tehran in her own hands. I pointed out how little he would have to show for the concessions made to Germany with regard to the Bagdad Railway if he now conceded this point and failed also to hold Germany to the engagements which he had asked for in the original text of article 3.

M. Sazonow replied that no settlement had yet been reached, but argued that in the event of his refusing to name a date for the completion of the Khanikin-Tehran line, he was justified in suspecting that its construction would be delayed on his side, and, on the other hand, would be very

fixed period. I pointed out that he would be giving Germany a footing in North Persia, and I added that such a step might lead to a serious conflict of interests. If an

Majesty's Government would be only too pleased, but at the same time I ventured to doubt whether too-ready compliance with all the demands put forward by Germany would achieve this desired result.

M. Sazonow expressed agreement, and said that he had told Count Pourtales only yesterday that he could not accept any material change in the sense of article 3, but he would be willing to consent to some modification of the text. He said that a committee of military experts was to be entrusted with the examination of the whole question of these railways.

M. Sazonow mentioned later on the possibility of an arrangement whereby Russia should participate in the construction of the line from Khanikin to Tehran to the Persian Gulf, but I fear that his views on this question are not very sound. I said to foretell at present what the final outcome of his negotiations with the German Ambassador would be.

[2863]

No. 44.

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lanthier.*

(N 25 Secret.)

8

*Foreign Office, January 24, 1911*

The Turkish Ambassador enquired on the 20th instant of Sir A. Nicolson whether you had been furnished with instructions to negotiate with the Turkish Government about the Bagdad Railway.

Sir A. Nicolson told Tewfik Pasha that His Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople had been informed that if Rifaat Pasha returned to that question His Majesty's Government would be happy to hear his views and to examine any project which might communicate to them. Your Excellency had been supplied with no special instructions, and there was no intention at present of formally negotiating, as nothing which to negotiate had been laid before His Majesty's Government by Rifaat Pasha.

Sir A. Nicolson repeated, however, that His Majesty's Government would be very glad to hear what Rifaat Pasha had to say, as they quite appreciated that the Turkish Government took a keen interest in a railway running through their territory.

Tewfik Pasha said that in the contract with the Germans the port and terminus of the railway on the Persian Gulf had been left open owing to the quasi-independent position of the Sheikh of Kuwait, and Sir A. Nicolson observed that perhaps, therefore, Rifaat Pasha contemplated discussing in regard to Kuwait, and that the ears of His Majesty's Government were always open to what he might say.

I am, &c  
E. GREY

[2304]

No. 45

*India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 26)*

A PARAPHASE of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 18th January, of which a decypher was sent to the Foreign Office on the 19th January, is enclosed, with the compliments of the Under-Secretary of State.

*India Office, January 25, 1911*

Enclosure in No. 45.

*Government of India to the Earl of Curzon*

(Telegraphic.) P.

*January 18, 1911*

RAILWAY across Persia

I have seen your telegram dated the 14th January.

There is advantage rather than the reverse, I venture to think, in the extension of Russian zone for purposes of Russo-German agreement. A railway could easily be built by Germany to any point on the frontier of Afghanistan between the intersection of the Russian and Afghan frontiers and Giazik. Now, an understanding with Russia is necessary before this can be done. Our interest in the adjoining Afghan frontier was expressly stated in the preamble of the agreement concerning Persia. If the object of the Anglo-Russian convention, viz., prevention of all cause of misunderstanding between Russia and Great Britain, is not to be frustrated, we have right to demand of Russia, in view of terms of preamble, that, in regions where the convention distinctly records our interests, she shall not agree to support the intervention of any third Power. It is an indisputable fact that in the rest of the neutral zone Germany has the right to seek concessions. In order to avoid disadvantageous effects to our political and strategic interests in Southern Persia, the only course open to us is to remind Germany of the assurances given by her to His Majesty's Government, and, when occasion arises, to repeat to the Persian Government our warning against granting any concessions by which our political and strategic interests in Persia may be prejudiced, and to threaten, if necessary, that steps to safeguard our interests will be taken.

[2863]

No. 46.

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie.*

N 25

8

*Foreign Office, January 26, 1911*

The French Ambassador asked me last week whether any negotiations were in progress between His Majesty's Government and the Turkish Government on the subject of the Bagdad Railway.

I informed his Excellency of the instruction to His Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople to inquire into the conversation between Sir A. Nicolson and Tewfik Pasha which is recorded in the despatch copy of which is enclosed.

I am, &c  
E. GREY

3540

No. 47

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie*

N 10

8

*Foreign Office, January 26, 1911*

The French Ambassador read to Sir A. Nicolson on the 20th instant a letter which he had received from M. Pichon reporting a conversation between the Russian Ambassador at Paris, in which he had intimated to M. Izvolsky that he hoped that M. Sazonow would keep the French Government informed of what might pass between the German and Russian Governments, so that the impression should not be produced that Russia was negotiating without taking France and Great Britain into her confidence.

M. Izvolsky quite agreed, and said that he would convey to M. Sazonow what had been said.

I am, &c  
E. GREY

3230]

No. 48

*Sir F. Cartwright to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 27)*

No. 11. Most Confidential)

(Telegraphic.) P.

*Vienna, January 27, 1911*

I AM informed very confidentially that the course which the present Russo-German negotiations are taking is causing a growing uneasiness at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs here, who are also apprehensive in regard to what took place at the Potsdam meeting. Any possible rapprochement between this country and Russia is considered to be retarded by the uncertainty felt in this respect, and by the delay shown in concluding the negotiations; for it is determined here that the pourparlers now proceeding in Berlin and Russia shall not be allowed to appear to be the origin from which an Austro-Russian rapprochement will evolve. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs here suspect M. Sazonow of playing a double game, and are not at all satisfied with the result.

Count Aehrenthal was asked by Count Aehrenthal why the negotiations were not proceeding more rapidly. M. Tschirchsky replied that the matters discussed required careful consideration of Germany, as they went further than the points which had been disclosed in the "Evening News." It was thus Germany, and not Russia, who was causing the delay.

It is doubted at the Ballplatz whether the German Ambassador's reply was made in order to conceal the fact that Russia is showing unwillingness to negotiate with Germany.

A report has been received from the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in St. Petersburg stating that M. Sazonow, in reply to an allusion made by the Ambassador to the Potsdam interview, said that the anxiety shown in France on the subject would calm down, and that Russia was mistress of her own policy.



Sir F. Bertie to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 28.)

(No. 56. Confidential)

Sir,

Paris, January 26, 1911.

I GAVE to the Minister for Foreign Affairs to-day an account of your conversations with the French and Russian Ambassadors, as recorded in your despatches of the 18th instant, viz., to me No. 28, Secret, and to Sir George Buchanan No. 19, Secret, omitting any reference to the possible participation of Germany in the Tehran-Khanikin Railway, and avoiding any mention of Persia and the neutral zone. M. Pichon had received a full account from the French Ambassador in London of his conversations with you. He entirely concurs in all your observations to Count Benckendorff. I have already spoken to M. Izvolsky much.

M. Pichon's opinion is that M. Sazonow, from his want of experience in negotiation and his awkwardness, has been misled by the German Government, and has committed himself in the matter of the Bagdad Railway in a manner which is detrimental to the position of France and England in further negotiations on the subject, but he agrees with M. Cambon that what M. Sazonow has done must be written off as a bad debt, and the French and British Governments must now keep closely in touch with each other and keep M. Sazonow to his promises in regard to the additional 4 per cent. railway customs, and prevent him from making further backslings.

M. Pichon then told me that, having learnt from the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg that there was an inclination on the part of M. Sazonow to allow Germany to build a railway from Khar-kin to Tehran, he had instructed M. Loub to tell M. Sazonow that France and England in Persia would not accept of the construction of the railway.

He said that the French Government could accept that Germany should be allowed to build a railway from Khar-kin to Tehran, but that it would not accept of the construction of the railway as a wedge between Russia and England.

I have, Sir,

FRANCIS BERTIE

Mr. C. Chamberlain to Foreign Office.—(Received January 30.)

Steam-ship "Dnanka" (off Khar-kin)

January 7, 1911.

Dear Mr. Mallet,

My attention has been drawn to a recent "Times" telegram from St. Petersburg, dated January 7, 1911, referring to the German note of 1907, and the interview there and at between the Czar and the Kaiser at Potsdam. In this telegram it is stated that Russian opinion would probably not be unfavourable to the linking up of Khar-kin with Tehran by a railway to be constructed at the cost of Russia.

It would, of course, by the ready communication which it would afford between Tehran and Bagdad—the German railway to which would doubtless be extended to Khar-kin—give a very serious blow to British trade and to British interests in Southern Persia, as it would unless a competing line be built from the Persian Gulf, tap the most populous and fertile portions of Persia, and retard indefinitely any developments of trade at the Gulf ports.

Under these circumstances it is extremely desirable, from the point of view of British interests, that the much discussed scheme of a railway connecting Mesopotamia with Western and Central Persia should, if practicable, be brought to an issue at the earliest possible moment, and I am venturing to trouble you with this letter because it

German Chancellor, receiving the attention of the Foreign Office.

It is also one that interests me considerably, not only in my capacity as a director of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, but as a partner in the firm of Lloyd Scott, and Co., which firm has now augmented its interests in the Persian Gulf trade by absorbing the Persian Gulf businesses of the firm of Messrs. F. C. Strick and Co. and also as a director of the Imperial Bank of Persia.

In these capacities I have given considerable attention to the subject in connection with the development of Persia, and of consultations with various persons, official and otherwise, who are acquainted with the conditions of the country and of its commercial possibilities. I have come to the conclusion that the construction of a railway from Ahwaz on the Karun, via Shuster, Dizful, and Burjird, to, say, Sultanabad, which would give easy communication to Kermanshah, Hamadan, Isfahan, and Tehran, would probably be the most complete and economical means of protecting British interests in the Gulf, and at the same time be the most complete block to German aggression, via the Bagdad Railway.

Such a railway would not be costly. I have not maps or figures before me, but it would certainly not be more than 2,000,000 to 3,000,000, and I am sure that the British and others who are well acquainted with the country would only tap practically the whole of the trade now carried between Persia and Bagdad (i.e., practically nullify the objective of the proposed Russo-German Khar-kin line), but also open up a large and new export trade in cereals from the districts around Burjird, Kermanshah, and Hamadan, which is now quite impracticable owing to the prohibitive cost of transport, and which would not even be open to the suggested German route because of the high river freight from Bagdad to the Gulf, and to Bagdad; (2) that it would in all probability be highly remunerative, and (3) that it would practically ensure to the British sphere the whole of the trade of Central and Northern Persia not secured by the Caspian, and also open up in competition with Russia a large amount of trade in cotton and other manufactures.

However good its prospects may be, however, and its prospects may be, it is without a guarantee of some sort, because of the instability of the country. In the case of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company the guarantee was provided by the British Oil Company because the potentialities of the concession were considerable and the benefits accrued to them only. In the case of the suggested railway, however, there are no such inducements, and a guarantee must come from a Government source. I have been given to understand that the Russian Government are disposed to guarantee the interest on the capital of the Russian portion of the proposed trans-Persian Railway, and according to the terms of the concession they are willing to do the same for the Khar-kin line. There is no chance of this, either being similarly overcome, either directly or indirectly, in the case of a British Ahwaz-Sultanabad Railway in the event of a

If so, the powerful financial groups which I represent would, I am sure, give their heartiest support to the furtherance of this scheme, and I could take up the matter on my next visit to Tehran where I expect to arrive at the beginning of March. Presumably there would be little difficulty in securing the concession, or the Russian Government thereof, as a *quid pro quo* for British assent to the Khar-kin concession.

Please do not trouble to reply to this letter otherwise than by communicating your views to Sir George Barclay, whom I shall be calling upon immediately after my arrival.

Mr. Norman has doubtless mentioned to you that I am visiting Tehran with the avowed object of bringing to a conclusion our outstanding negotiations with the Persian Government for the loan of 100,000,000, and the mining concession, and also of discussing various questions in dispute in connection with telephone lines, barges on the Upper Karun, customs duties, &c. At the same time I shall also arrange for the appointment of a permanent agent for the company in Tehran—probably Mr. Brown, of the Imperial Bank of Persia—in pursuance of Sir George Barclay's recommendation.

Yours faithfully,

Sir G. Lister to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received January 30)

Sir,

Pera, January 23, 1911.

REFAAT PASHA said to me to-day that he and the Government were anxious to do what was possible with a view to bringing about a disappearance of the policy of "hardcore" between Great Britain and Turkey. His language was similar to that

used by him to Mr. Marling, as recorded in his despatch No. 918, Confidential, of the 20th ultimo.

I said I was entirely with him in the matter, but I should like to have some what he meant. There had been no sulking on our part. It was true we had had to make some serious complaints of the way our subjects had been treated at Bagdad and elsewhere by the officials of the new régime, but I have also endeavoured to make the settlement of these cases as easy as possible for the Turkish Government. We had also had to complain of certain acts of aggression and breaches of *status quo* in the Persian Gulf, and it yet seemed doubtful whether the promises of the Porte had been carried out in this direction. It was the Turkish press and in some cases Turkish members of Parliament who had used language

against Britain, and this had troubled me. I did not see of what the Turkish Government had to complain. Did his Excellency allude to the loan which, in circumstances to which it was unnecessary now to return, had not been concluded in England? I could not imagine where Turkey could find a grievance against us. If he alluded to the paucity of British bankers, concessionaires, and competitors for orders who now came to Turkey, I must admit that there had been some disappointment felt by such. Many had been called, but few had been chosen. They had found business here somewhat cumbersome, infinite delay, and in the end the margin of profit so small that they were hardly compensated for expense and trouble, even if successful, in obtaining some small orders.

His Excellency was unable or unwilling to be more precise, but he said that the friendship of the mass of the people of this Empire had always been very marked in favour of Great Britain, and any Minister who wished to initiate an anti-British policy could not live a day. I replied that I had always believed that this was the case, and therefore it struck me as especially extraordinary that the little energy in settling matters in which our right was un-  
doubted evidence of General Nazim, who, he said, imagined that the clock had been set

back at Bagdad, his Excellency was one for the conclusion of some arrangement for the Bagdad Railway. I replied that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

no answer regarding the Bagdad Railway. I said that I was convinced you would be glad to see us. I had been awaiting his Excellency's proposals since last summer, which led me to believe that he was on the point of submitting them. It was only when I read his Excellency's said he thought the Persians did not wish to attach importance to the railway, that I could give

[3401]

No. 52.

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey — (Received January 30.)

(No 25 Secret)

THE conversations which I have had with the Minister for Foreign Affairs during the past fortnight, and the language held to me by the Emperor on the Orthodox New Year's Day, confirm me in the belief that neither His Majesty nor his Foreign Minister contemplate giving any new direction to Russia's foreign policy. More than this it would be dangerous to say at the present moment, as it is impossible to predict what will be the final outcome of the negotiations now proceeding between M. Sazonov and the German Ambassador. These negotiations are being protracted

when the form of the railway is being discussed. I obtained at such a simple matter to reveal the us in a diplomatic act, and when I first arrived at St. Petersburg he spoke of three weeks as being sufficient for the purpose. Nearly two months have now elapsed, and the end seems as far off as ever. It would indeed almost appear as if the language held by the German Chancellor at Potsdam has been purposely pitched in the softest of keys, so as to encourage M. Sazonov in the belief that he was about to secure a diplomatic success, and thus to induce him to enter into negotiations from which he could not withdraw without making the loss of his personal position. His Excellency, however, was discovered to his cost that the assurances which he had given in the course of his conversations with M. Bethmann-Hollweg and M. von Tschirsky were being given rather a larger interpretation than he had intended.

Why not then have let the Germans have the railway which was to give them access to the Persian markets? Such an arrangement would, he thought, be more acceptable to public opinion in this country than an undertaking which could only promise to

control the railway. I also repeated to him what you had said to Count Benckendorff respecting the danger of the line being used in times of pan-Islamic excitement for the transport of Mussulman forces, and reminded him that when I had mentioned the matter to him on a former occasion he had told me that the railway would be virtually under the control of Russia. I added that if he now launched over the railway a

which a way as to enable Germany to obtain from Germany in return for all the concessions which he had made with regard to the Bagdad Railway. I ought perhaps to explain that, in order to avoid useless repetition, I am summarising the various conversations which I have had with M. Sazonov during the past fortnight, and that his Excellency is very prone to shift his ground. While he has consistently treated the danger to which you alluded Count Benckendorff's attention as a purely imaginary one, he has not been equally consistent in the arguments to which he has had recourse in order to disprove its existence. More than once he has

control the railway. I also repeated to him what you had said to Count Benckendorff respecting the danger of the line being used in times of pan-Islamic excitement for the transport of Mussulman forces, and reminded him that when I had mentioned the matter to him on a former occasion he had told me that the railway would be virtually under the control of Russia. I added that if he now launched over the railway a

which a way as to enable Germany to obtain from Germany in return for all the concessions which he had made with regard to the Bagdad Railway. I ought perhaps to explain that, in order to avoid useless repetition, I am summarising the various conversations which I have had with M. Sazonov during the past fortnight, and that his Excellency is very prone to shift his ground. While he has consistently treated the danger to which you alluded Count Benckendorff's attention as a purely imaginary one, he has not been equally consistent in the arguments to which he has had recourse in order to disprove its existence. More than once he has

control the railway. I also repeated to him what you had said to Count Benckendorff respecting the danger of the line being used in times of pan-Islamic excitement for the transport of Mussulman forces, and reminded him that when I had mentioned the matter to him on a former occasion he had told me that the railway would be virtually under the control of Russia. I added that if he now launched over the railway a



contended that neither the Sadjeh-Khanikin nor the Khanikin-Tehran Railway will ever exist except on paper and that all that the German Government is aiming at is to obtain some assurance from Russia which will satisfy public opinion at home that everything is being done to safeguard Germany's economic interests in Persia. On occasion, however, he adopted an entirely different line of argument. Russia, he said, was close by in the Caucasus, and we therefore had nothing to fear, as on the first indication of such a danger she would at once send her troops to Tehran. This remark is very characteristic of the light-hearted manner in which he regards the very serious consequences which the engagements that he is now about to take may eventually entail. It was in much the same spirit that he recently said to me that we could always oppose the construction of the final section of the Bagdad Railway by sending a blockade to the Gulf.

In conversation which I reported in my telegram No. 19, Secret, of the 24th instant I endeavoured once more to impress on him the importance of keeping the absolute control of the Khanikin-Tehran Railway in the hands of Russia. Were the Russian Government, I said, to learn that Germany was to acquire the right to construct and control that line, they would be far less likely to take a favourable view of the trans-Persian railway scheme. It was, moreover, surely not to the interests of Russia to give Germany a footing in North Persia which might undermine Russia's influence at Tehran and occasion serious friction between the two Empires. His Majesty's Government, I added, would be only too glad were the negotiations now proceeding to result in an arrangement satisfactory to Russia, but I ventured to doubt whether compliance with all of

Mr. Sazonow did not attempt to rebut these points, and acquiesced entirely in my last remark. He had, he said, informed the Czar of the previous day that, while ready to consider an amended text of article 3, he could not enter on any proposal that would in any way weaken the material effect of that article. It is satisfactory to know that on this point, at any rate, Mr. Sazonow proposes to take a firm stand, and it is not improbable that pressure is being brought to bear on him by the military authorities, who will, as he tells me, have to examine the railway question from the strategic point of view. As regards the question of the control of the Khanikin-Tehran line, I fear that his Excellency is far from sound, though the last thing which he said to me on the subject was to arrange that Russia should participate to the extent

I think, he is not in any way committed himself in the question of the Turkish customs dues. He has always told me that the article 1 of the draft agreement that no pecuniary sacrifice was to be required from Russia was specially inserted in order to leave her a perfectly free hand with regard to this question. He has also informed me that he had explained at Potsdam that, as this was a question which concerned Russia's general foreign policy, it could not form one of the subjects of discussion between the two Governments. He has more than once tried to argue, in defence of the line he has taken, not to oppose the realisation of the Bagdad Railway. I, however, have taken France has ever directly opposed that scheme, and that they have only offered it a negative opposition by declining to give it their financial support. As the proposed scheme cannot be enforced without their consent, they still are, a very effective weapon for opposing the completion of the line. He mentioned to me the other day that he had heard that a project for a railway from Mohammurah to Khanikin, and he strongly advised us to give it our support. It could, he believed, be built entirely on Persian territory, and its construction might prove fatal to the continuation of the Bagdad Railway beyond that town. I said that I had never heard of the projected railway, but that I rather doubted whether, if it were constructed, the Germans would ever renounce the idea of bringing the Bagdad Railway down to the Gulf.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN.

P.S. Since writing the above Mr. O'Boone has called my attention to his despatch No. 436, Confidential, of the 2nd November last, in which he reported the suggestion made by M. Izvidsky that Russia should agree that, if she did not construct the Khanikin-Tehran Railway within a specified number of years Germany should regain

her liberty of action in the matter. As I was dining with Mr. Sazonow last night I asked him whether he thought it would be possible to amend article 2 in the sense that if, when the line from Sadjeh had reached Khanikin, Russia had not commenced the construction of the Khanikin-Tehran line, she should come to an understanding with Germany for a joint construction of the latter railway. Mr. Sazonow replied that he had only yesterday been considering whether an arrangement of this kind might not be possible, but that he rather doubted whether Germany would consent to it.

G. W. B.

[3414

(No. 19.

Sir,

THE German press continues to be very active in its attacks on the German negotiators and the version of the Russian proposals published in the "Frankfurter Zeitung". Most of the articles written on the subject in that paper, without doubt, grow very much in favour of Germany; that, whatever the French and English papers may write, this solid fact cannot be altered, and that the only hope left to those responsible for the misrepresentation published in those newspapers is that they may be able to create mistrust to Germany in the eyes of the public naturally interested in what has passed between the Russian and German

The German press has not deployed an almost feverish anxiety to allay any feeling which these negotiations may have produced amongst the Turks, and to show that if such a feeling exists it is entirely due to the manoeuvres and the misrepresentation of the French and British, and to a certain extent the Russian press.

As you will see from the enclosed translation of a leading article of the "Cologne Zeitung", which has every appearance of being officially inspired, this note is still being sounded, although pains are taken to show that owing to the frank explanation given by the German Ambassador at Constantinople these manoeuvres have failed, and the uneasiness felt by the Turks has nearly if not entirely disappeared.

The article is also not without interest from the point of view of the arguments it produces to show that while the Bagdad Railway is and must always be an eternal Ottoman concern, Germany is interested in it and feels bound to take whatever steps she can to push it on, partly because it will strengthen German trade and commerce, but also because it will strengthen the Ottoman Empire.

The importance both to Germany and the world in general, in the manner in which this question is regarded by sensible people in Germany, and the hope that there will be no more nonsense talked of Germany's territorial and other ambitious schemes in Mesopotamia which a

of German chauvinists as to the malevolence of the foreign press.

I have also the honour to enclose a translation of an article in the "Frankfurter Zeitung" of yesterday. I am unaware whether this article is inspired or not, but it may in any case be of some interest to you as being an example of the way in which the question of the accuracy and the origin of the "Evening Times" publication is being treated in the German press. If the article does emanate from the Imperial Foreign Office it is interesting to note the statement which it contains, to the effect that when the real agreement comes to be published it will be seen that it is far more favourable to German interests than the apocryphal draft proposals would lead one to suppose.

I have, &c.

W. E. GOSCHEN.

Enclosure 1 in No. 53.

from the "Kölnische Zeitung."

#### TO MANY AND TURKEY

of the Turkish Chamber as to the much discussed communication of the contents of the Potsdam agreement have had a thoroughly satisfactory issue. The Minister for Foreign Affairs was able to reduce the Turkish paper to their real importance, and to prove that the thought of challenging the just claims nor injuring the susceptibilities of the Ottoman people. It is to be hoped that public opinion in Turkey will now be reassured. It was no doubt secured by a great excitement produced by the European papers in systematically misleading the public against Germany. Our friends must be congratulated on the cleverness which they displayed. The German paper, which was being displayed in Turkey was found to be wounded by the news that Germany had come to an agreement with Russia about the internal affairs of Turkey. This piece of news was intended to disturb the good relations existing between us and Turkey. Only it was once more proved that lies have short legs, and not only the Porte but also the cooler political circles in Constantinople could perceive themselves that Germany had not been desirous of interfering in matters which do not concern her.

In article 3 of the supposed Russo-German agreement Germany was supposed, according to the "Evening Times," to have undertaken to build no railways in another zone except the line from Bagdad to the Russian frontier and that from Kharkov to North Persia, and to lend no material or diplomatic aid to similar undertakings in that zone. To put this somewhat obscure wording in the right light, our good friends assured that the zone in question was Turkish East Asia Minor. A look at the map will show that this territory does not at present possess any railway lines. Neither Erzurum, the important frontier fortress facing towards Russia, nor Erzurum, the westerly and most important garrison of this part of the world and, according to the old division of the army, the seat of the general command of the XVth Army Corps joined either to one another or to the coast. No railway runs from the ports of Samson and Trabzon to the interior, and the last station in the distant Angora, where the Anatolian Railway ends. Under the old head of which, Abdul Hamid, was altogether opposed to railways running

in harbours, Russia succeeded, by force to an agreement prohibiting the construction of the Black Sea unless the construction of Russian enterprises impossible, the

laying of railways which would strengthen

itary point of view. By the down

oriented. Young Turkey is now buying herself with preparations with the aim of developing the land near the Black Sea and of forming a connection through Asia Minor with Angora and the capital. By this means provinces containing mineral treasures would be placed in a position to send their products to the national market, out of the way districts would be drawn nearer to the rest of the central government, and troops could be quickly despatched from the eastern frontier who at present would spend several weeks on the march, and the event of a conflict with Russia would in all probability arrive too late.

There is of course, the aforementioned agreement in view.

Russia. Germany has neither the right nor the desire to trouble which the Porte undertakes for Turkey. Such questions must be decided by the Ottoman Government's consciousness of its own power and it may be assumed that Young Turkey would at the present time not conclude such a treaty. In any case, however, the subject is one which does not concern us, and calm reflection must from the outset have made all alarmist reports concerning German intervention

doubtful. The Ambassador, Baron von Marschall, was also in a position

the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs that there can

ention, and, after the discussions in the Ottoman Chamber have been co

view will, we hope, prevail. But one must not count upon it too confidently,

against Germany has been carried on among the Turkish people for

by such invidious methods that it is very difficult to end to it. In this connection it may be remarked that the Anatolian present ends in a branch in Angora, has no concession for a continuation eastwards to Sivas, Erzurum and Erzerum, as is often supposed. The truth is that this line in 1893, at the time that permission was given for the line from East Sivas to Konia, received also a concession for the line towards Kars, which lies to the south east. This section is about 400 kms long, and the kilometre guarantee is fixed at 17,600 fr. Whether this line will be built in a measurable space of time remains to be seen. This section is not included in the Turkish Convention, and therefore

do Germany is only just not in watching over us in so far as she ensures the protection of the line interested in this gigantic undertaking. We

know that the Railway Company is an Ottoman company subject to Turkish law. The building is an internal concern of Turkey's, kilometres added to the line of rails which stretches out from Asia Minor towards Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf means more strength to the power of the Porte in districts where her force up to the present has rested on but weak foundations. Waste lands, which were formerly thickly populated, can again be brought under cultivation, the mobilisation and transport of troops will be made easier, the whole Empire's

and offices will be raised. All these things interest Turkey but Germany, on the other hand, is only interested to the extent as to how far the new Ottoman State will be capable of developing and ensuring her independence and how she will acquire necessary strength for that purpose. The stupid talk of German schemes of domination in Mesopotamia which has unfortunately been aggravated by much

the part of irresponsible and for the most part badly informed German chambers, gradually perished of its innate absurdity, and nothing but malice could revive it. In spite of this, German diplomacy is bound to promote with all its

the construction of the Bagdad Railway, because it offers peaceful participation to the construction and it must be the task of our Government to open doors which are closed to this line the German interest in overcoming which the construction depends, and a policy of land acquisition or of undue influence in these districts to the detriment of Turkish rights is naturally out of the question.

#### Enclosure 2 in No. 53

Extract from the "Frankfurter Zeitung" of January 23, 1911

WHEN, on the 6th January, that mysterious publication as to the alleged of the Russo-German Potsdam agreement appeared in the "Evening Times" the object of the trick was at first not quite clear even to those who immediately recognised the clumsy forgery. Was it merely a question of a journalistic stunt with no other object than momentarily to rescue a little known paper from oblivion? Or did some interested diplomacy play a false card, in order to darken the clearness of the situation? All signs pointed to Paris, where the semi-official "Agence Havas" quickly put the false coin in circulation through the Paris papers, and all explanations were excluded. The interpretation of the "Novos Vremya," according to which German diplomacy and the German semi-official press has resorted to the premature publication of the agreement in defiance of the understanding come to in order to exercise pressure on the still hesitating Russian neighbour. The veil was lifted a little when it became possible to observe the effect of the agitation and to draw conclusions from it; immediately after the "Evening Times" publication there appeared in the "Lancet," which is in close touch with the Turkish Government, articles which not only subscribe to the authenticity of the text of the Russo-German agreement, but, moreover, gave to that text in some places an interpretation not justified by the wording. The article showed a serious feeling of alarm lest Turkish interests might be adversely affected by the agreement, and a feeling of discontent that Germany was negotiating with a third power about Turkish interests without obtaining Turkish consent. It was now clear, those who were jealous of the Potsdam agreement had laid the train in such a way that



1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

2. The second part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

3. The third part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

7. The seventh part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

8. The eighth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

9. The ninth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

10. The tenth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

*[The page contains extremely faint, illegible horizontal lines suggesting ghosting or bleed-through from another page.]*

As regards the reasons given to you by M. Sazonow for the inclusion in the part of Persia dealt with in the draft agreement of a portion of the region left to the Anglo-Russian arrangement respecting Persia, you should inform me that I appreciate the reasons which have led him to follow this course, especially I am most assured that the Russian Government would not support the requests of third parties for concessions in that region to such requests being made without previous consultation with His Majesty's Government.

[3724]

No. 56

Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(No. 56)  
S.E.

Paris, January 31, 1911

COUNT BENCKENDORFF asked me to-day whether I had any further information as to the Russo-German negotiations.

I said that I had now heard that M. Sazonow thought it possible that he might be pressed by Germany to agree to make the Khar'kin connection with a definite time. If this was so it might be convenient to ease the financial burden which would be imposed on Russia by getting Germany to undertake the construction of the line from Khar'kin to Khar'kin. Germany had now been categorical to the Turkish Government that the provision of article 3 of the draft which had become public, binding her not to make any railways in Asia Minor north of Khar'kin.

The urgency of preventing Germany from getting concessions for railways in Northern Persia had been pleaded by M. Sazonow originally as the necessity for procuring the Khar'kin junction. The promise of Germany not to apply for railway concessions in Northern Persia and to refrain from making railways north of Khar'kin in Asia Minor, had appeared to be the *quid pro quo* which Russia received for the concession she had made. It looked now as if the *quid pro quo* was disappearing altogether, and generally the negotiations seemed to be in a very fluid state.

Count Benckendorff was evidently not satisfied by the prospect, and asked whether I had said anything at St. Petersburg.

I replied that I felt that the construction of railways in the northern part of Asia Minor and in the north of Persia was a matter which concerned the Russian Government more than us. The point which I regarded as one for me to press at St. Petersburg was that the Russian Government should keep themselves free to support, when necessary, to secure reasonable terms respecting the Bagdad Railway and that in this connection was the consent to the 4 per cent. Turkish customs duty. It would be disastrous if M. Sazonow were to take the course of his negotiations as.

Count Benckendorff said that he assumed that it was out of the question that this point should be given up.

I am, Sir,  
Yours faithfully,  
EDWARD GREY

3856

No. 57

Sir P. Balfour to Sir Edward Grey -- (Received February 1)

No. 4. (Confidential)  
Telegraphic.) P.

Paris, February 1, 1911

RUSSO-GERMAN negotiations

In the course of an interview with the Minister for Foreign Affairs to-day his Excellency showed me a telegram which he had received from the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg, reporting a recent conversation with M. Sazonow. According to this account M. Sazonow informed M. Lams that he hoped it would be found possible to conclude an agreement with Germany. The Russian Government, however, considered that on military grounds they must insist on a *quid pro quo* on the maintenance of article 3 of the draft agreement, by which Germany undertook not to construct railways between the Bagdad line and the Russian and Persian frontiers, nor to support applications for the construction of such lines. M. Sazonow further

said that exaggerated statements had been made as to the importance of Russian commerce in the north of Persia, that there was no intention on the part of the Russian Government or of the Duma of repeating the blunders connected with the Manchurian and Eastern Chinese Railway, and they would not be prepared to make pecuniary sacrifices to secure the construction of the Tehran Khar'kin Railway; that is the Germans regarded this railway as an essential part of the agreement it would doubtless be found advisable to permit its construction by Germany, or to reserve a per cent. share in it for Russia, which would give to the Russian Government a controlling interest in the line. This latter alternative would be the best if means could be devised for finding the funds necessary without involving any charge on the Russian Government.

M. Pichon appears to be much perturbed at the situation between Germany and Russia, and he told me that he had been talking to the Russian Ambassador on the subject. His view is that should it become necessary to allow Germany to participate in the construction of railways in Northern Persia, she should only be permitted to do so on condition that other Powers, including France, also co-operated.

394

Sir P. Balfour to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 1)

(Confidential)

P.

Paris, February 1, 1911

RUSSO-GERMAN negotiations

In my preceding telegram of to-day's date, I have the honor to report that I met M. Pichon at a dinner-party this evening, when he told me that he had read to the Russian Ambassador the telegram from M. Lams reporting the conversation which he had had with the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs. M. Pichon was, however, not able to furnish any satisfactory explanation in the matter. M. Pichon reminded me that, with a view to supporting the policy of Russia, the French Government had abstained from putting forward any applications for

for the Persian Government services, and he said that he would not be able to justify before Parliament the attitude adopted by the French Government if their abstention were to result in the introduction of Germany as a wedge between Russia and England. M. Sazonow, he added, had failed to communicate with the French Government in any way before he committed himself with the German Government. The present position of affairs was most unsatisfactory. His Excellency suggested that the Russian Ambassador, as a personal idea on his part, that it would be better that the Khar'kin Tehran line should be constructed by a Russian, German, French, and British combination rather than that it should become a purely German or a Russo-German undertaking.

In regard to this suggestion I stated to M. Pichon that the Anglo-Russian agreement precluded us from obtaining concessions in Northern Persia, and that in the event of our joining in an international combination such as he had mentioned, it might be expected that in Southern Persia we would admit Russia and Germany to participate in the construction of railways.

3858

No.

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 1)

(No. 23. Secret)

(Telegraphic.) P.

St. Petersburg, February 1, 1911

RUSSO-GERMAN negotiations

My telegram No. 22 Secret, of the 30th January

I saw M. Sazonow to-day, and pointed out to his Excellency that by the terms of the Bagdad Railway concession the line to Khar'put was the only one that the Germans had bound themselves to build. M. Sazonow said that he knew this, but that the concession gave the Germans the option of constructing certain



which they wished to avoid themselves in the matter of the Mosul. They desired further to construct a branch running eastwards in the direction of the Persian Gulf. The other M. Sazonov nor the German Ambassador had been able to find on the map the place to which the branch was to run. The terminus of the first of these lines was at the foot of a high range of mountains, while both of them would run at a considerable distance from the Russian frontier, so that he did not see how he could object to them. The question was to be examined by the military authorities.

I said that it seemed to me that both these lines would bring the Turks dangerously near to the frontier of

[3623]

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(No. 21. Secret.)

(Telegraphic) P.

TEHRAN-KHANIKIN line

Foreign Office, February 1, 1911

The language you used to M. Sazonov in your conversations with him on this subject (see your despatch No. 25 of the 20th and your telegram No. 22 of the 30th ultimo) has my entire approval.

I attach far greater importance than does M. Sazonov to the Pan-Islamic danger and I do not understand how he can regard this point with indifference, more particularly in view of the apprehension which he himself has always expressed of Turkish railways in Asia Minor directed towards the Russian frontier, and of our failure to induce the Turks to withdraw from the Crimea district.

It must be remembered that if the Tehran-Khanikin line is built entirely by any day be at the disposal of the Turks for aggressive purposes, and I therefore attach the greatest importance to Russian construction and control. If M. Sazonov is not prepared to insist on this, I strongly hope that he will adopt proposed amendment of article 2 in the sense suggested in the postscript of your despatch referred to.

Sazonov's difficulty is financial, there could be two alternative solutions. I hope M. Sazonov will seriously consider. The first would be that if suggested some time ago, should participate

of the railway. British capital would in this case probably be forthcoming, especially if Russia retained the option of construction for a certain time.

As it will be some time before the Sadak branch is begun, it would not be necessary to mention such an arrangement to Germany, who could not object to a

The other alternative would be the internationalisation of the line by the admission of French capital also, Germany to have 30 per cent, and the rest to be reserved for Russia, who would divide her share with Great Britain and France.

[4080]

No. 61

Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie

No. 14)

(Telegraphic) P.

TEHRAN-KHANIKIN line

Foreign Office, February 1, 1911

My telegram No. 13 means that line should be international only if Russia shares the option of making it herself. On this understanding our position in the south would in no way be impaired.

4365

No. 6

Sir F. Bertie to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 4)

Paris, February 4, 1911

M. Sazonov and informed him of the views and suggestions of M. Pichon, as instructed by your telegram No. 13 of the 2nd instant, and find it necessary to inform his Excellency that His Majesty's Government would be in a position later on to adopt a similar view in the case of a line constructed in Southern Persia, substituting in such case the word "British" for the word "Russian," as his Excellency concurred in the views expressed by you in your telegram No. 21 Secret, to Sir G. Buchanan of the 1st instant and said that he would at once instruct M. Lams by telegraph to act with Sir G. Buchanan and support his representations. He quite understands that your suggestion is that the Khanikin line should be international only in the event of Russia relinquishing the option of constructing it.

The action of M. Sazonov and the weakness he has shown in his negotiations with Germany are

you, himself, and M. Sazonov, and he said that he had made a suggestion to that effect to the Russian Ambassador. The latter, M. Pichon said, has promised at his request to communicate the suggestion to Russia direct, but he does not feel confident that, even if M. Izvolsky says to do so, he will carry out his promise.

I suggested to M. Pichon that, although M. Sazonov might be perfectly willing to make a declaration as he mentioned if he were a free agent, he might find it difficult to do so at present on account of his negotiations with the Germans.

[4364]

No. 63

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 4)

No. 26.

(Telegraphic) P.

St. Petersburg, February 4, 1911

RUSSO-GERMAN negotiations.

Your telegram No. 21 of the 1st February.

I spoke last evening to M. Sazonov on the subject of the Tehran-Khanikin line in the sense of your above telegram.

M. Sazonov said that though the line would never be dangerous to Russia from the strategic point of view, he quite understood

control being in Russian hands. But he found himself faced by the opposition of Finance and the general public (refused to) of the line.

The Tehran-Khanikin line was constructed under German auspices before the North Persian Railway was completed. Russian influence at Tehran would be fatally undermined, and Germany would be supreme in the Persian capital. Moreover, he would be sacrificing the most important of the concessions which he had succeeded in inducing the Germans to make at Potsdam.

To this M. Sazonov replied that it was just as impossible for Russia to prevent the construction of the Tehran-Khanikin line as it had been for her to oppose the scheme for the Bagdad Railway. If she had placed her veto on the construction of the Tehran-Khanikin line, Germany would have been free to obtain concessions of a far more

tion of the Tehran-Khanikin line she had induced Germany to

M. Sazonov added that the French Ambassador had just been informed as to the possibility of internationalising the line. The suggestion that British and French capital might participate in the construction of the line had been made to him to-day for the first time, and he welcomed it cordially as a possible solution of the difficulty.

I expressed a hope that, if this suggestion were adopted, Russia would see her way to contributing her quota of the capital required, but M. Sazonov expressed his

[1775]

P

doubt as to whether any capital would be forthcoming from Russia, and said that he was not even sure that British capital would be available when the time came for employing it. I said that at present the most important point was that he should not commit himself forthwith to concede either the whole or the partial construction of the

the cons

M. Sazonow replied that the idea of such a formula had occurred to him, he had been thinking of proposing it. He then went on to talk at length of the conciliatory spirit which Germany was showing in these matters, and said that he had no difficulty about accepting the proposed formula, while if she refused it I should show that she had been humbugging him up to now.

4471

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey—(Received February 6.)

(No. 29. Secret.)

(Telegraphic) P.

RUSSO-GERMAN negotiations.

My telegram No. 29 of the 1st February.

In conversation with M. Sazonow, his Excellency said that he hoped that in about a week or two he would be able to report to the Emperor and to the Council of Ministers a revised text of the draft Russo-German agreement. This text, which would be communicated to Count Pourtales as the reply of the Russian Government to the counter-proposals put forward by Germany, and he would also let me know it.

I urged M. Sazonow not to show any weakness with regard to the provisions of

to the French Government. On my observing that I thought that the French

M. Sazonow replied that an arrangement on those lines would be the fairest one, but, however, that the balance of 75 per cent. of the cost of construction would be taken up eventually by England and France, as it was impossible for Russia to supply any of the required capital. To this I replied that Russian views on this point might have undergone some change, and that, if the proposed formula were adopted, her hands would be left entirely free to participate or not in the

44448)

No. 65.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan.

Foreign Office.

CAMBON told me to-day that Rifaat Pasha had

French

railways in the region of the Black Sea, and a railway in Albania.

cover of Turkey, it was desirable that the French Government should give a favourable reply to the Turkish proposal.

\* Also to Sir P. Baring, No. 50. Secret.

M. Cambon then told me that he thought it would be well that his Government and ourselves should agree to meet at St. Petersburg, and come to a definite understanding with M. Sazonow as to our position with regard to the Bagdad Railway.

that if M. Pichon would settle what he desired to say at St. Petersburg.

that he had been writing to St. Petersburg everything that we could wish.

I also told M. Cambon that Rifaat Pasha had talked of making proposals to us about the Bagdad Railway. We had said that we should be ready to receive and consider them, but in matter of fact no proposals had yet been made to us, and nothing was being done.

I am, &c.

E. C. GREY.

4216

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan.

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 6, 1911.

ON the 27th ultimo the Turkish Ambassador called at the Foreign Office and informed Sir A. Nicholson that he expected to receive any day the project of his Government in regard to the Bagdad Railway. He mentioned from a letter he had lately received from Rifaat Pasha that he was waiting your return in order to communicate the project to you, that an arrangement must have been arrived at with Germany, where the latter abandoned her participation entirely in the construction of the line south of Bagdad. Otherwise Ferik Pasha did not see the utility of the Turkish Government discussing the matter with His Majesty's Government if Germany still held it. This point, which was an essential one, would be

I am, &c.

E. C. GREY.

44972)

No. 67.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan.

(No. 38.)

THE Russian Ambassador asked Sir A. Nicholson to-day, on behalf of the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, in what form and to what amount British financial participation in Tehran-Khankai line would be afforded.

Sir A. Nicholson told his Excellency that he was naturally unable to give him any definite answer. His Government had suggested as one alternative that, if Russia's views might be found to turn it by a participation of British capital, to how that capital would be furnished would have to be pending the receipt of data necessary to form an opinion.

to your Excellency

reserving to herself the right to invite the participation of foreign capital.

I am, &c.

E. C. GREY.



Sir F. Bertie to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 7.)

With reference to my telegram No. 6, Secret, of yesterday, I have the honor to inform you that at the interview which I had with the Minister for Foreign Affairs with the view of carrying out the instructions contained in your telegram No. 1 of the 2nd instant, I allowed him to read Sir George Buchanan's despatch No. 25, of the 26th ultimo, which I gave to his Excellency without the postscript to it. After M. Pichon had read it, and told me that he had received from the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg information similar to that reported by Sir G. Buchanan, his Excellency the memorandum, of which I enclose a copy herewith. He concurred in your proposals, and would send the memorandum to M. Loure. I left the memorandum with M. Pichon, after which I have received from him this morning returning to me the memorandum, he states that he has instructed M. Loure to concert with and act with Sir G. Buchanan in the sense desired by you in regard to M. Sazonow's negotiations with the German Government on the subject of the railway from Khankin to Tehran.

I have, &c.  
FRANCIS BERTIE

Memorandum communicated to M. Pichon.

(Secret.)

His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg has learnt from M. Sazonow that the Russian Minister of Finance, whilst anxious to secure a 60 per cent. Russian participation in the Tehran-Khankin

for some such arrangement as the following:—If, when the line from Esfahan had reached Khankin, Russia had not commenced the construction of the Khankin-Tehran line, she would come to an understanding with Germany for a joint construction of the latter railway. Germany had, so M. Sazonow informed Sir George Buchanan, declared her readiness to give an undertaking to build the line

the line with her or alone. If Germany were to build the line she might that Russia should acquire the right to purchase the line on completion thereof prior to be taken by arbitration. Count de Poutalea had told M. Sazonow that

herself to build certain branch railways under the Bagdad Railway Convention. M. Sazonow said that one of these railways was to run to Karabekir and Kharput from a junction on the Bagdad Railway, and that if the others, which he had not had time to examine, also ran parallel to the Russian frontier, exception might be made in their favour. In the case of railways running towards that frontier, however, such an exception could not be made.

Sir E. Grey has informed Sir G. Buchanan that he attaches the greatest importance to Russian construction and control of the Tehran-Khankin line, expressing a strong hope that if M. Sazonow does not feel prepared to insist on this he will adopt the alternative proposal made by the Russian Minister of Finance referred to above, viz. if, when the line had reached Khankin, Russia had not commenced the construction of the Khankin-Tehran line, she should come to an understanding with Germany for a joint construction of that railway. Sir E. Grey pointed out further to Sir G. Buchanan that if the line were built entirely by Germany it might any day be at the disposal of Turkey for purposes of:—some time ago by the Russian Minister participate in the construction of the Tehran-Khankin line, and it is at Sazonow's difficulty were of a financial nature British capital would probably be available, especially if for a certain time the option of construction were retained by Russia. Any need not be informed of this, for she could not raise objections to a

Russia could reserve the rest, dividing this share with England and France. He considered that by both these proposals the financial difficulty could be turned, and expressed the hope that M. Sazonow would take these alternatives into serious consideration, as he attached far greater importance than M. Sazonow did to the danger from Turkey. He expressed surprise at the indifference shown by the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs on that point, especially after the failure of the endeavours to secure the withdrawal of Turkey from the Armenia district, and in view of the apprehension always expressed by M. Sazonow of Turkish railways in Asia Minor running in the direction of the Russian frontier.

His Majesty's Government attach great importance to the above proposal, and they are strongly of opinion that if Russia relinquishes the option of making the Tehran-Khankin line, that line should be international to the extent proposed by M. Pichon.

British Embassy, Paris,  
February 4, 1911

[4644]

No. 69.

Sir G. Loder to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 7.)

(No. 29.)

(Telegraphic.) P

BAGDAD Railway

Constantinople, February 7, 1911

As Mr. Loder has just received from the German Government a copy of a letter from the German Minister of Railways to the Ottoman Minister of Railways, in which the German Government expresses its willingness to consider the proposal of the Ottoman Government for a joint construction of the Baghdad Railway, and in which the German Government expresses its willingness to consider the proposal of the Ottoman Government for a joint construction of the Baghdad Railway, I have the honor to inform you that the German Government has agreed to the Potsdam agreement.

We suggest that our action might take the form of a joint communication to the Sublime Porte to the effect that all negotiations connected with the completion of the line to Bagdad must be taken conjointly with France and Great Britain. We should add that our Governments consider it quite insufficient for the Ottoman Government to submit an agreement already arrived at, and that we cannot hold out to the Sublime Porte any hope of our agreeing to the 4 per cent. increase failing a preliminary agreement. I have just received from the German Minister of Railways a copy of a letter from the German Minister of Railways to the Ottoman Minister of Railways, in which the German Government expresses its willingness to consider the proposal of the Ottoman Government for a joint construction of the Baghdad Railway, and in which the German Government expresses its willingness to consider the proposal of the Ottoman Government for a joint construction of the Baghdad Railway, I have the honor to inform you that the German Government has agreed to the Potsdam agreement.

[4364]

No. 70.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(No. 34)

(Telegraphic.) P

Foreign Office, February 7, 1911

I APPROVE your language as reported in your telegram No. 26. M. Sazonow might be told that I trust he will seriously consider formula you suggest as likely to meet present difficulty. We should be ready to consider whether it would be possible to raise sufficient British capital for participation in Tehran-Khankin line were the Russian Government unwilling to take over the whole financing and construction of it themselves. Failing this the alternative of internationalisation could be entertained (see my telegram No. 21), but in view of the fact that we have no idea whatever as to probable cost of construction of line, and that this and other data are naturally necessary, we think the best solution would be the acceptance of formula you suggest, as we should then have time to study in detail the amount and mode of participation of British capital, either wholly or in conjunction with others.





His Majesty's Government from every point of view. We had always urged that Russia should herself construct and finance the line, and the wording of his formula would still enable her to do this, should she ever wish it.

On my asking M. Sazonow whether it would not be possible for him to furnish me with a copy of the revised text of the draft Russo-German agreement, which I might send to you by bag to-morrow, his Excellency replied that he could not do so, as the text would not be ready for submission to the Council of Ministers till next Saturday.

I then pressed him to tell me in what respects the original text would be modified. He said that article 3 would be omitted from the agreement altogether. The substance he embodied in notes to be exchanged between the two Governments. Copies of these notes would be communicated to England and France. The words "without a previous agreement with the Russian Government," would be inserted in the engagement to be taken by Germany.

Germany considered that a public declaration to the effect that she had no political interests in Persia would be derogatory to her dignity as a Great Power, and article 4 would therefore begin with the following words: "the special political interests recognised by the German Government," &c. M. Sazonow explained that Germany could not be expected to give more than a declaration.

The words "as well as other concessions of a territorial nature," which formed the end of the first paragraph of article 4, would be omitted. This was explained by M. Sazonow as being due to Germany's objection to the exclusion of her subjects from acquiring concessions for forests and mines.

In view of M. Sazonow's frequent changes of front I cannot even now guarantee that the final wording of the text will be exactly in the terms which his Excellency indicated to me.

I only observed to M. Sazonow that I hoped that, in communicating his proposals to Count Pourtales, he would let the latter understand that it was impossible that these negotiations should be allowed to drag on indefinitely.

His Excellency replied that he would tell Count Pourtales that it was impossible for him to accept any further modification of the general sense of the agreement, though he was prepared to consider any alterations of a purely verbal character.

4673

No.

Sir F. Bertie to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 9.)

(No. 7.)

(Telegraphic.) P

Paris, February 9, 1911

BAGDAD Railway negotiations

I met M. Pichon to-night and found that he had received from the French Ambassador a suggestion similar to that mentioned in your telegram No. 18 of to-day and telegram No. 29 from His Majesty's representative at Constantinople of the 7th instant. He said that though there may be no legal ground for a protest by France and England on the subject of the negotiations conducted by the Porte with the Bagdad Railway Company in connection with the proposed line to Bagdad, he thinks it would be advisable to warn the Porte that, if the French and British Governments, whose

matters they cannot be expected to give their consent to the proposed 4 per cent. increase in the customs. Instructions on the subject have been sent to M. Cambon, who has been directed to speak to you in regard thereto.

M. Bompard has reported from Constantinople that an agreement has nearly been reached between the railway company and the Porte, the latter having declared itself ready to devote the whole of the surplus revenues to the payment of the kilometric guarantee. The Turkish Government are, however, unwilling to concede the sheep tax in addition, which the company is anxious to obtain, and this is the only obstacle remaining to the conclusion of the agreement.

4644

No.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie

(Telegraphic.) P

Foreign Office, February 9, 1911

BAGDAD Railway.

Inform M. Pichon of the substance of Sir G. Lowther's telegram No. 29, and state that His Majesty's Government consider that it would be impolitic to enter a protest against the conclusion of arrangements for continuation of line to Bagdad, seeing that it would be disregarded by Turkish Government, as being unjustified on any legal grounds whatever. Until, however, they are aware of the views of the French Government they will withhold their reply.

4972

No. 77.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, February 9, 1911

THE Russian Ambassador asked Sir A. Nicolson to-day on behalf of the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs in what form and to what amount British financial participation in the Tehran-Khanikin line would be afforded.

Sir A. Nicolson told his Excellency that he was naturally unable to give him any details. His Majesty's Government had suggested as one alternative that, if Russia's difficulty was a financial one, means might be found to turn it by a participation of British capital. Details as to how that capital would be furnished would have to be arranged.

It was explained that British participation could be effected by a loan guaranteed by the Government. Sir A. Nicolson replied in the affirmative, and gave him the substance of my telegram No. 21 of the 1st February.

Sir A. Nicolson added that to his mind the best course for M. Sazonow to pursue would be to adopt your Excellency's suggestion, viz., to find a formula to the effect that Russia would engage to construct the Tehran-Khanikin line at a given date while reserving to herself the right to invite the participation of foreign capital.

G. H. Y.

4975

No. 78.

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 10.)

St. Petersburg, February 10, 1911

Please see my telegram No. 30 of the 8th instant.

In a conversation which I had with the Minister for Foreign Affairs last night, His Excellency informed me that he had inverted the order of things when remodelling the draft agreement. The Koush Bagdad section will first of all be referred to, and it will be stated later on in the text that "Russia engages not to oppose the above-mentioned railway." He expressed the hope that this new formula would meet our wishes, though he could not guarantee that the German Government would accept it.

His Excellency added that, as far as article 3 was concerned, he would only obtain the acceptance by the German Government before them.

[4873]

No. 79.

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Louthier*

(No. 29.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

*Foreign Office, February 10, 1911.*

PLEASE telegraph your views as to revenues which Bagdad Railway Company may expect Turkish Government to earmark for their use (see Paris telegram No. 7 of the 10th February)

[5122]

No. 80

*Chairman to Sir Edward Grey — (Received February 11)**St. Petersburg, February 11, 1911*

I. S. C. T. MAN negotiations

I was sent for yesterday evening by M. Sazonow, who said that the apprehensions aroused in London by the question of the Tehran-Khankin Railway had caused him much uneasiness. M. Sazonow said that he had thought that His Majesty's Government had understood from what he had told them both before and after the Potsdam meeting that the line was of vital interest to Russia. He now recapitulated his remarks on the

we feared the possibility of the control of the line passing into M. Sazonow protested that he had never had any int

branch the a Count Pourtales. I denied that I had ever reported in this sense to but said that I had considered it my duty to point out to them that the cession of the line to Germany was a possibility which we could not afford to disregard. I recalled to his memory the language which he had held to me on this subject on various occasions, and reminded him that on one occasion he had said to me that the best line would really be for Germany to defray the cost of the construction of the line the opinion that had been expressed in the Council of Ministers by the Minister of Commerce, but that he, for his part, had always advocated that control should be kept in Russia's hands.

I told him that a telegram which I had sent to you (my No. 30 of 8th February) would by this time have set at rest any apprehensions which might have existed. M. Sazonow then read to me a telegram which he had received from Benckendorff, who reported that he had had a conversation on the subject with Mr. Tyrrell, who had told him that, in the event of Germany giving her consent to the proposed combination, Great Britain would but share of the required capital with out any difficulty. M. Sazonow expressed a hope no mention of this matter had been made by us to Germany. If Germany got wind of the scheme she would refuse to accept his new formula unless a share in the construction were allotted to her also. His idea was that the Tehran-Khankin line should be made a purely Russian undertaking, and that Russia should be left free to make whatever financial arrangements might suit her. On my inquiry of what I had said on this point in my telegram No. 30, he replied that I had expressed his views quite accurately. At the same time, he begged me to inform you of the great importance which he attached to the idea of British participation in the future being kept secret and not mentioned either in diplomatic or financial circles.

M. Sazonow then went on to say that the revised version of the draft Russo-G agreement was still awaiting submission to the Council of Ministers, that he could not copy of it, but that he would allow me to read it on the understanding that it was in the strictest confidence.

In the preamble the principle of commercial equality is recorded and recognised that Russia possesses special political interests, while a purely commercial character is ascribed to those possessed by Germany.

The 4th article of the original draft appears as article 1 in the new version, but all reference to cession of a territorial character is omitted.

In article 2 Russia pledges herself to obtain from the Persian Government a concession for a line to link up with the Sadighi-Khankin line, when the construction

of "this branch of the Kasseh-Bagdad Railway" shall have been completed. Tehran specified as the eastern terminus of this link line from Khankin.

In article 3 Russia undertakes not to place any obstacles in the way of the construction of "the above-mentioned railway," stipulating at the same time that she will not be required to make any sacrifices of a pecuniary nature. At the end of this article is attached a revised version of the article 3 of the former draft, by which Russia engages not to lend material or diplomatic support to schemes for constructing railways in the district to the north of Khankin referred to in the original draft.

It might be well to express our appreciation of M. Sazonow's action and to tranquillise the agitated frame of mind in which he is at present. He seems to have done his best to meet our wishes. I fear, however, that Germany will not be inclined to welcome the text as now revised.

[5147]

No. 81

*Constantinople, February 11, 1911*

Information I have received it has been calculated, taking the averages of expenses of the ceded lines and revenues for the last five years, that the annual surplus at the Government's disposal (not taking the customs surtax into account), and therefore available for the Bagdad Railway has amounted to £ T. 334,000, and that no less than £ T. 900,000 will be at the disposal of the Government from the same sources in the present financial year, taking the returns as at present known.

For the Halif-Bagdad section about £ T. 300,000 is required (without counting £ T. 70,000 for working expenses). There is every reason to suppose that this sum will be fully covered, but the railway company seem anxious to get the sheep tax of the Adana, Aleppo, and Kasseh vilayets (assigned by the last convention) as an additional guarantee.

Above refers to your telegram No. 29 of the 10th February.

[5122]

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan**Foreign Office, February 11, 1911*

Your telegram No. 33.

in Affairs may rely on our discretion. Please express to him my thanks for his friendly communication, and my satisfaction, and assure him that we have said nothing to

[5149]

No. 83.

*Sir G. Louthier to Sir Edward Grey — (Received February 12.)*

(No. 36.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

*Constantinople, February 12, 1911*

BAGDAD Railway. (See embassy telegram No. 34 of 11th instant.) According to the "Tanin," a paper in close relations with the Ministry of Finance, an annual increase of £ T. 60,000 on the revenues already put aside for the construction of the line will suffice for the extension of the line to Bagdad, and the 4 per cent. increase on the customs duties has no connection with this.

It is conceivable that the £ T. 60,000 represents the difference between the amount needed, including working expenses and guarantee, for the line from Halif to Bagdad and £ T. 334,000 surplus of taxes and revenue. If the Halif-Bagdad section is rather more than 600 kilom. in length, this supposition may be correct.



Sir G. Louthier to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 12.)

(No. 37.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 12, 1911

BAGDAD Railway (See Foreign Office telegram No. 24 of 9th February and No. 1 of 10th February)

It is, I still venture to think, very desirable that some communication should be made to the Porte. The form I would suggest might be a request to be acquainted with the nature of the arrangement about to be arrived at in order to see whether safeguards have been provided for British and French interests.

Should the Porte now conclude an arrangement with the Germans, without mention being made of the Bagdad Persian Gulf sections being modified in any way, then in the negotiations which we expect to conduct with Turkey the latter will have nothing to offer us. This will weaken our position as against Germany and Turkey very considerably, and the practical result will be that we shall either have to accept their terms or assume in the Koweit and 4 per cent. questions an uncompromising attitude.

It might be possible for us to omit any reference to the 4 per cent. question and confine ourselves to saying that we shall show no great disposition to deal favourably with Turkish requests for assistance in matters touching their interests if British interests have not been borne in mind during the Turco-German negotiations.

It would seem that the agreement between the railway company and the Ottoman Government is on the point of being reached, and it is considered that it will be possible to avoid reference of the agreement to Parliament. It is not, however, possible

the company are said to be very light

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 20.)

Sir,

St. Petersburg, January 31, 1911

The following official communiqué was published in the press of the 28th instant:

"Amongst other questions discussed at the meeting of the Council of Ministers on the 13th (20th) January was that of the construction of an Indo-European transit

able to the proposal brought forward by the  
prise that a special commission ('société d'études') should be  
stituted for a preliminary study of the question, on the understanding, however, that  
the realisation of the scheme will not involve loss to the Russian Treasury or damage  
the region

this subject will take final  
it an agreement"

On my alluding to this communiqué in the course of conversation with M. Sazonow yesterday, I enquired whether the condition that the Imperial Treasury was to suffer no loss meant that the Government would only give the projected railway their moral support. His Excellency replied that anything in the shape of a Government guarantee was out of the question. The only financial support which the enterprise would receive would be a certain share in any surplus profits which might accrue to the State railways from increased receipts due to the transit traffic in goods and passengers through Russia.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 13.)

St. Petersburg, February 6, 1911

I TOOK the opportunity of a conversation which I had with the Minister for Foreign Affairs this afternoon to speak to him in the terms of your despatch No. 31 of the 31st ultimo on the subject of that portion of Persian territory that was left neutral by the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907.

His Excellency gave me the assurance that the Russian Government would not support the requests of third parties for concessions in that region, nor consent to such requests being made without previous consultation with His Majesty's Government.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN.

Sir G. Louthier to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 90)

Sir,

Pera, February 8, 1911

WITH reference to my telegram No. 29 of yesterday relative to the progress of the negotiations for the completion of the Bagdad Railway to Bagdad, I have the honour to enclose a semi-official communication, published in the "Jeune Turc" of yesterday on this subject.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN.

Enclosure in No. 8

Extract from the "Jeune Turc" of 7

LE CHEMIN DE FER DE BAGDAD

UNE réunion a eu lieu dimanche au kiosk du grand vizir a laquelle ont assiste les Ministres des Finances, des Travaux publics et M. Huguennin, directeur general du Chemin de Fer de Bagdad. La conversation a roule sur le tronçon reliant Haleb à Bagdad de 600 kilom., ainsi que les sommes destinées à la garantie kilométrique. Avec

six ans, toute force majeure prévue. Ils serment attaqués des deux côtés à Bagdad et Haleb.

Le Chemin de Fer de Bagdad espère mettre en exploitation dans quelques mois une partie du tronçon Eregh Adana dont les travaux sont très avancés.

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 13.)

St. Petersburg

THE Russo-German negotiations have made but little progress during the past week. In the conversation repeated in my telegram No. 22, Secret, of the 30th ultimo, M. Sazonow informed me that the question of the Tehran-Khankin Railway was still under discussion, and that it was complicated by the fact that the Minister of Finance had declined to assume any financial responsibility for the construction of the line. He had himself been trying to conclude an arrangement under which Russia would participate to the extent of 60 per cent in the undertaking in return for a 10 per cent control; but, while he would have no difficulty in assent to this, he did not know how to secure the necessary

he must admit, had approached the question in the most conciliatory spirit, and was willing to accept any arrangement agreeable to Russia. All that she

...leave the construction, either in  
...to build the whole line her-self. In t  
latter case, she would give Russia the option of purchasing the railway  
constructed, at a price to be settled by arbitra

On my asking his Excellency whether it was true that the 100,000 francs would be raised in four or five years, he replied that the 100,000 francs was exaggerated but that at present it was impossible to estimate either the cost of its construction or the approximate amount of the receipts which would eventually yield. Count Pourtales had assured me that Baghdad would reach Bagdad in four or five years, the 100,000 francs would be raised.

... articles was trying to bluff him, but it was possible that  
contemplated postponing or even abandoning altogether, the continuation of  
great Railway to the Gulf, and diverting any capital which she might have set  
aside for the Gulf section to the construction of the Kuakoo-Tekoa line.

With regard to the railway referred to in article 3 of the M. Sokolow said that the German Ambassador had told him that, Germany had in intention to construct certain line was to run from a point on the main line to D'arick

their favour. When I saw his Excellency again a few days later, I pointed out to him that the Esker-Kiarput line was the only one which the Germans were under an obligation to respect, and that, as regarded the other lines mentioned in article 12 of the Convention, they were a mere nullity. His Excellency replied that he was aware of this, but that he was bound to respect the Convention.

of this, but that the Germans wanted to exercise this option in the case of two lines, namely, one from Mosul to Arbil and the other from a point on the Diala to a place which neither he nor the German Ambassador had been able to find on the map. As both these lines were at a considerable distance from the Russian frontier, and the first of them had its terminus at the foot of a lofty mountain range, he did not see he could object to them. I contented myself at the time by remarking that they seemed to me to bring the Turks within dangerous proximity of the Persian frontier but in a subsequent conversation, I called his attention to the fact that the Mosul Arbil Railway would give the Turks direct access to the Urmia district if, as was always

Mr. Sokolow admitted that there might be some truth in this, but said that the line from the Dniep was, he believed, only intended to tap some naphtha springs not very far off. He added that if it were so, while he personally saw no objection to the Danubian-Kharput line, the whole question of these railways would have to be carefully examined, as in the case of the other two lines. Germany had only the option, and not the obligation, to build them; he thought that it ought not to be difficult to come to some agreement with respect to the

I saw his Excellency again on the 3rd instant and communicated to him the substance of your telegram No. 21 of the 1st instant, laying especial stress on the fact that the railway in question, which is to be constructed in the Persian Gulf, is attached to the Tehran Khamkin Railway being constructed and controlled by Russia. M. Sazonov replied that he quite understood and shared the views on this question, though he did not himself see how this line in any circumstances, be a danger to Russia from a strategic point of view. He said all along been endeavouring to retain the control of this railway and that as neither the Minister of Finance nor the Russian public opinion towards its construction, the position which he had taken.

The French Ambassador, his Excellency then proceeded to say that just before he left London, and had also spoken about the internationalization of the Nile. The idea that British and French capital might participate in the enterprise was a new but well-

enquiring whether, in the event of this idea being adopted, Russia would vote her quota, his Excellency replied that it would be impossible to raise any money in Russia towards such an undertaking and he very much doubted whether when the time came, any British capital would be forthcoming. He would, however, do all in his power to attain a solution of the question in the sense suggested. I remarked that the important thing at the present moment was that Russia should not commit herself by any promise to cede the railway either as a whole or in part. He replied, "I quite understood the financial difficulty with which I was confronted. I would ask him to reflect on the total blow that would be struck to Russian influence and prestige in Persia were Germany to

At Saranow replied that he had not committed his Government in any way at present, but that Russia could no more prevent the eventual construction of the Iran-Kashan line than she had been able to oppose the Bagdad Railway scheme. I then obliged to consent to the construction of this line in any remuneration of other and more important things in the East. I might one day have included the concession for the North Persian

ever thought that Germany would accept a formula to the effect that when the Sin hieh line reaches Kiamukin "la Ruene procédera à la construction de la ligne Kiamukin Tchernia, en se réservant le droit d'inviter la participation de capitaine

some such formula might not get over the difficulty, and after we  
he has so often told me of the conciliatory and straightforward manner in which  
y has throughout treated the question of this railway, remarked that he did  
not see what objections she would raise, I observed that if she did raise objections  
his Excellency need not listen to them, as they would prove that all that Co.  
Pourtalen had told him hitherto was humbug and that Germany wanted the railway  
for of us than trade.

... on the 6th instant, M. Kuznetsov of his own  
... working that the situation had changed greatly.

latter now that there was a question of the participation of French and Russia  
at. I then asked whether he had come to any decision about the formula, and  
His Excellency replied that he was quite in favour of the one which I had suggested,  
but that he feared that Germany would raise objections unless she was also admitted  
on an equal footing with England and France, and he believed that the French  
Government wished to exclude her altogether. As, in a conversation  
with my French colleague a few days ago, M. Loubet had suggested that Germany's  
share should be restricted to 25 per cent., I said that I did not think that this was  
the case, and that if 25 per cent. were allotted to Germany, the remaining 75 per cent.  
might be divided between the other three Powers. His Excellency agreed, but added  
that France and England would have to divide Russia's share between them. I  
remarked that it was to Russia's interest to leave the door open so that she could do  
what she liked when the time came. The Sadr ul Khair Khan said that under the  
most favourable circumstances he completed for another six years, and many things  
might happen in that time. Russian public opinion might then take an entirely  
different view of the matter, and favour the idea of the line being wholly or mainly  
constructed with Russian capital.

In the course of our conversation Mr. Excellency told me that he hoped about the end of the week to lay before the Council of Ministers the revised text of the draft agreement, and that, after it had been sanctioned by the Emperor, he would communicate it to Count Pourtales as Russia's reply to the proposals and amendments. He had submitted with respect to the original draft. He showed it to me. The question on which it would be the most difficult to arrive at an agreement was that relative to the text of article 3, which deals with railways to the north of Khankin. This matter was, he considered, such an important one for Russia that he would be obliged to make a firm stand with regard to it. I encouraged him in this idea as I think that a Russo-German railway line from Mowul to Arbat would be fraught with danger to Anglo-Russian interests in

At 8 o'clock again yesterday afternoon and communicated to him the substance of your telegram No. 14 of the 27th instant on the subject of the



Karakum line. His Excellency replied by reading to me two telegrams which he had received from Count Benckendorff reporting a conversation which he had had on the same subject with Sir Arthur Nicolson. He then proceeded to say, with considerable warmth, that the French had quite lost their heads and were accusing him of

understanding with Germany behind their backs. In it was they who had originated the proposal for the international participation of German capital. I asked him whether he had told me the other day that the French wanted to keep them out of the undertaking, but his Excellency denied ever having said so. He then, he continued, thought over the formula which I had suggested, but he was of the opinion that it would necessarily involve German participation and that he desired. He had therefore prepared another: "La Russie s'engage à obtenir pour elle-même et à procéder à la construction de la ligne." This was

what he would have done, alone. I told him, the necessary capital and would leave Russia free to form whatever consortium she pleased when the time came. The question as to the exact amount of capital which Great Britain would eventually contribute need not be discussed at all, as he did not wish to press for any definite commitment on this point. It was that he had been assured of the participation of British and French capital was able to act as he was doing.

gauge, one would imagine that he had never entertained the idea of asking the railway in whole or in part to Germany, and I think the changed attitude is probably due to the language which Sir Arthur Nicolson have held to the Russian Ambassadors in London and Paris. I told M. that, so far as I could judge, nothing could be done. It appeared to meet our view, and I was glad to find that the Russian Ambassador was able to meet our view.

I forward to you by to-day's messenger a copy of the draft of the Convention as it would only be submitted to the Council of Ministers on Saturday. It is, I think, very different to the draft as it was necessary to change the wording completely, so that it might not in any way resemble the version published by the "Evening Times." After some pressing, however, M. Sazonov informed me that the principal alterations introduced into the original

will disappear from the agreement, and the engagements taken by the Convention to the north of Khartoum will be recorded in an exchange of notes, of which copies will be communicated to England and France. The engagements to the south, however, he must hold by the Convention as in the Russian. Otherwise

on these points I am of the opinion that it was better. I told him that I was glad to hear that she had no political interests in Persia and, though the French Ambassador had reminded Count Pourtales, made an assurance which the German Government was now giving, equally made the purpose. The words "ainsi que d'autres concessions de caractère territorial" the last line of the first paragraph of the same article will be omitted as it objects to her subjects being precluded from seeking mining or forest concessions.

any observations on these new concessions which M. Sazonov made to them. I expressed the hope, however, that his Excellency would give Count Pourtales clearly to understand that he would not allow the negotiations to be indefinitely prolonged by further demands on Germany's part, and M. Sazonov informed me that he proposed saying that, he will not consent to any more

so rapidly from day to day that the Convention will exactly correspond with

I have, &c.  
GEORGE W. BUCHANAN

Sir E. Spry to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 13.)

Dear Sir Edward,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th inst. in relation to the Bagdad Railway. I am, Sir, a resident of the Bagdad Railway, being my cousin, I was in a favourable position to negotiate a commercial agreement, of which the basis would have been the control by English capital of the southern part of the line from Bagdad to the Persian Gulf.

I expressed myself sanguine with regard to the result of such negotiations. Your reply was to the effect that the Bagdad Railway could be done without "une conversation à quatre," as you could not act without the knowledge and consent of France and Russia.

The Germans declined to discuss the matter on that basis, and the matter dropped.

It was resumed by Sir Ernest Cassel, with your knowledge, and, as I understand

the question entered upon a more acute phase. It is a note to the Persian Government alarmed the Turks. The claims put forward by Great Britain as to her rights and privileges in the Persian Gulf section increased Turkish suspicion, so that the chances of Turkey agreeing to Germany's plan of building that portion of the concession to build the southern section of the Bagdad Railway to British capitalists are now very much reduced, if indeed they have not disappeared altogether.

The Potsdam understanding has removed Russia from the group of Powers supposed by the Turks to be antagonistic to the Bagdad Railway enterprise.

The position was further complicated by the Turkish loan negotiations, which terminated in the signing of a contract with Germany for 11,000,000 Turkish pounds after France and England had declined to assist Turkey.

When I saw Sir Arthur Nicolson shortly afterwards he said that the Foreign Office did not then encourage British capital being put at the disposal of the Turkish Government, and at my interview with you in January you confirmed that, although you were not altogether averse to British investments in Turkey.

I ventured to tell you that as Turkey was a country with great resources, but in equally great need of capital to develop them, it seemed a pity if Great Britain were to miss the opportunity of participating in such development.

To continue a negative policy seems to me to place Great Britain at a political and commercial disadvantage. Reports from Constantinople which I have received from a person of position and authority who went out on my firm's behalf fully confirm

British attitude towards Turkey, and of demonstrating that Great Britain's friendship for Turkey still exists.

My proposal is to try to obtain that option stock and

satisfied that there is no chance of participating in the firm stock, as the rate, having taken the risk and being certain of placing the stock in the hands of the Turkish Government, would not for a moment consider any such proposal, but it would in my opinion be worth while trying to obtain the option stock for this country, and I vent to urge this, as I have reason to know that a friendly attitude on the part of the British Government in this matter would be welcomed in Turkey, and, further, would pave the way for an agreement regarding the Bagdad Railway. Russia could not now object, and as regards France, it is common knowledge that her objection to the loan was to a great extent due to the jealousy of each other amongst competing banking groups. Moreover, I understand that France has practically sanctioned a Turkish loan of 2,000,000 for making roads.

Action of the kind I have ventured to suggest, if taken at all, should be taken very soon, but as I stated to you at our last meeting, I would not move without the good-will and encouragement of the Foreign Office. If that is forthcoming, I believe I shall be in a favourable position to negotiate for securing the option bonds.

I am as confident as regards the outcome of such negotiations as I was two years ago regarding the Bagdad Railway proposals, and I trust that Great Britain will not miss this opportunity

I am, &c  
EDGAR SPEAR

5394

Peterborough, February 13, 1911

RUSO-GERMAN negotiations. Your telegram No. 41, Secret, of the 11th February

M. Sazonov is much pleased with your message, which I conveyed to him today, but he tells me that he is now faced by a new difficulty. On his submitting the revised version of the agreement to the Council of Ministers, that body had expressed the opinion that an outcry would be raised in Russia if the Government, before taking any step to build a railway in North Persia to promote the economic interests of that country, should pledge itself to construct a railway which would facilitate the export of German goods. On the other hand, the Duma would never sanction the grant by Government of a guarantee for railways in Persia which would be a hindrance to the need of railway development. It is therefore necessary for financial support to Paris and London. The construction of the line from Enzeli to Tehran would be sufficient, and he hoped to secure financial support from the French and English financiers who were ready to participate in the construction of the line from Khanikin to Tehran. Secrecy must be observed with regard to the latter line until the agreement with Germany was published, while there was no such obligation with regard to the line from Enzeli to Tehran. It was therefore necessary that the two lines should be treated separately.

On my suggesting that he should take the opportunity of the publication of the Russo-German agreement to announce that the Russian Government intended to obtain a concession for the line from Enzeli to Tehran, his Excellency said that, before doing this, he must be sure that he could lay his hands on the money required for the construction of that line. I asked whether he would be satisfied with the offer from His Majesty's Government to the effect that they would do what was in their power to assist the undertaking, but more definite than this. The line from Enzeli to Tehran should, he thought, be considered as a first stage in the construction of the line from Khanikin to Tehran, and he pointed out that the construction of the former line might be regarded as a first stage in the construction of the latter line. He said that it was impossible for him to hand to me the revised text of the draft agreement in its present form until he received from London and Paris some assurances as to the financial aspect of the question.

5574

No. 41

Sir G. Loder to Sir Edward Grey (Received February 11)

(Telegraphic) P.

BAGDAD Railway

Negotiations with Bagdad Railway Company are being conducted on the following basis according to a voluntary statement made to me today by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

No revenues, such as future "temettu," future monopolies, surplus of ceded territory, &c., beyond those already accorded, to be asked for by the company.

The company would probably grant the company an outlet at the Persian Gulf, and call on it to give up its right to construct the section from Bagdad to the Persian Gulf, which was in a fair way of being reached, the internationalisation of the Bagdad Persian Gulf section, though remaining an Ottoman railway, would be

71

proposed by the Porte to Great Britain and Powers interested, the suggestion being that France, Germany, ourselves, and possibly Turkey, should join in acquiring shares.

Although Bassorah could easily be turned into the outlet, the Turkish Government would prefer Koweit, but for that an arrangement with Great Britain as to its political status would be necessary. His Excellency observed that, from the standpoint of the preservation of the present *status quo* was impossible, and obviously a territory was the only terminus for an Ottoman railway. His Excellency added that the international syndicate should also build the terminal port.

His Excellency asked me to keep what he had said secret, and observed that his object in speaking to me had been to let His Majesty's Government know the general status of the Ottoman Government in the matter, and that he would eventually communicate the proposals of the Turkish Government in writing.

His Excellency added that he would use similar language to the French

5647

No. 42

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(Telegraphic) P.

Foreign Office, February 14, 1911

I HAVE been considering the best means of safeguarding British interests in connection with the question of railway construction in Persia. In view of recent events and the rumours of a large railway loan, it would appear to me to be advisable to recall to the recollection of the Persian Government the despatch of the 16th September, 1888, which the then Shah addressed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, giving a positive assurance to His Majesty's Government that no southern railway would be granted to a foreign country without previous consultation with them, and that they should have priority over others in the construction of any line in that area.

It might be well to remind the present Ministers of the existence of this assurance, which may have escaped their notice, and to say that we consider it to be still binding, and assume that it will be observed as a matter of course, notwithstanding the passage of time (the analogy of the Bagdad Railway Convention would be a good one).

Before, however, making any communication to the Persian Government, and those of the Government of India.

In the Persian Government to accept such a communication, we would add that His Majesty's Government, by their solicitude for the security and independence of Persia, and by a desire for the expansion of British commerce, would be willing to discuss with the Persian Government the question of railway construction in the south, whenever they are ready to establish authority, and the safety of transit would advance the economic welfare of Persia as much as it would benefit our commerce. But the disposition of the Persian Government must determine to some extent the discussion of the whole subject.

M. Sazonov has himself suggested to Sir G. Buchanan that we should apply at once for the concession of a line running from Mohammerah northwards. No opposition, need be anticipated from Russia on this head, and commercial opinion generally would be in favour of such a line.

In these circumstances, the two lines to which we attach the most importance are—

1. A line from Mohammerah northwards to Khoremsabad, with a branch to a port to be constructed at Khor Musa.

A line from Kerman to Bunder Abbas.

Others in order of merit are the following—

1. A line from Bushire via Ahakad to some port.

A line from Bunder Abbas via Shiraz to Ahwaz.

If we decide to apply for a concession for the building of No. 1, I should like your views on the rather difficult question of how we ought to proceed in the matter. Should we in the first instance approach the Persian Government; or



should we apply to the shah and obtain their concurrence afterwards?—  
with the Persian Government we should bear in mind the effect such act

away would have to be more or less under British management, though it  
would obviously remain Persian in name. The Persian Government might receive a  
stage of shares as purchase money for the concession, while the syndicate who  
in detail, but I do not anticipate any difficulty in obtaining money in the city for

Before instructing Lieutenant Wilson to proceed with the survey of the section  
(excluding that portion within the Russian sphere), for which it would  
the circumstances to utilise his services, we should like  
it will be safe for him to undertake the work in the present  
whether he could do so at all without t

5394

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, February 14, 1911

Your telegram No. 30, Secret, of the 13th February  
In the case of any railways which would secure better access for British and  
Russian trade to Persia His Majesty's Government would be quite willing to see British  
capital help in their construction. The question of how British trade can be enabled  
to compete with rival routes from Mesopotamia by means of certain lines in Southern  
Persia is at the present moment under consideration, and in this connection it would  
be well to refer to M. Sazonov's correspondence which took place in 1908, respecting  
Jaffa-Mohammerah Railway. He will see that throughout we have been influenced  
by motives precisely corresponding to those by which Russia is influenced with regard

guarantee. We shall have to face  
southern lines, for which we could not  
guarantee. A factor it would be  
no money for railway construction in Northern Persia when no  
guarantee is forthcoming from the Russian Government. If we decide to give an  
guarantee ourselves, we can of course only do it for southern lines, of which you will  
hear more, as scheme now in consideration matures.

We had assumed, in case of Tehran-Klankin line, that there would be a Russian  
guarantee, or, if not then, an international guarantee, and I hope that M. Sazonov  
will see that it is impossible to induce British capital to invest money in north Persian  
railways without a guarantee, and to do for Russian trade in the north of Persia what  
it would certainly not do for British trade in the south.

5575

No. 94

Sir E. Goschen to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 15)

(No. 46)

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to report that the "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung"  
its usual summary of the events of the week, refers at some length to the Bagdad Railway  
question, and says that

to the Persian Gulf, and that all negotiations connected with the scheme would be  
conducted by the Turkish Government direct with the company and not with the  
German Government, the "Norddeutsche" reproduces, by way of comment on this

statement, a telegram sent to the "Kölnische Zeitung" by its Berlin correspondent  
which sums up the official German attitude at the present moment in the w

the Bagdad Railway Company to welcome the  
in the enterprise, the "Kölnische" says  
in or for objecting  
tion of the  
let then goes on to observe that if other people had been equally  
railway might by this time have been completed, and then no doubt  
would have been left us to its real character, which was that of a great transversal ar-  
ded in the first place to open up the more inaccessible parts of T  
nd to benefit equally the commerce of all nations. "In the consciousness that t  
is intended to serve those purposes alone," says the "Kölnische," "it is

foreign press, which have no justification in fact.  
"Hamburger Nachrichten" also reproduces the telegram from the "Kölnische"  
stating that it was probably inspired by the Deutsche Bank. It then goes  
to quote a recent announcement in the "Neue Politische Korrespondenz" to the  
effect that up to now negotiations between Germany and England with regard to the  
Bagdad Railway had failed in consequence of the English demand for the inter-  
nationalisation of the line—a demand which  
could not accept, as the Bagdad Railway was a Turkish enterprise, which was only  
being financed and carried out by Germany. The "Hamburger Nachrichten" says that  
attempt to obtain any control over the line, she could only be  
be condit, on of her unreservedly assuring to Turkey  
whole railway. Finally the article discusses the question  
on the Persian Gulf, "where Persian, Turkish, and Arab territory meet, the  
ally under Turkish sovereignty but in reality partly independent and partly

the line must terminate at Koweit, the writer quotes "an apparently semi-official  
statement" in the "Münchener Neueste Nachrichten" saying that the German  
Zaimog ground that Hamamah will have to be chosen as the  
instead of Koweit. The "Hamburger Nachrichten" concludes by saying that it  
concurs in this view, as it would be much better that the line should, from beginning to  
end, be built on Turkish territory.

I have, &c.,

W. E. GOSCHEN

5736

No. 95

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 15.)

St. Petersburg, February 15, 1911

No. 49 of yesterday. Russo-German negotiation

ation in the sense of your above telegram to M. Sazonov

from the Russian  
that M. Pichon, in speaking of the proposed  
Iran Railway scheme, had used hopeful and  
language, and I had promised to submit the proposal to the French C  
of Ministers. He was evidently depressed by the nature of your reply. I asked him  
what steps he proposed to take, and he said that he had led the German Ambassador  
to understand that he would communicate the revised version of the draft  
to him before the end of the present week, and he did not see how it would be  
now for him to prevent the Klankin-Tehran line from falling to the Ge  
urged him not to abandon the formula which he had shown me, and pointed out that  
Russian public opinion might be satisfied if he would apply for a concession for  
the line from Enzeli to Tehran; time would thus be given to us for discussing the  
necessary financial arrangements. To this M. Sazonov replied that this would never  
be accepted by the Council of Ministers unless they got an assurance from us that  
Russia would not be required to defray the cost of construction. I next suggested  
that he might revert to the formula which I had proposed to him originally, but he  
said that this formula would also be objected to by Council of Ministers, which would

1773

refuse to be a party to any arrangement calculated to secure a free port for Germany. I ventured to point out that Russia, by refusing to give any guarantee, would be virtually abandoning all idea of influence in Persia or of maintaining her influence in that country. To this he replied that perhaps I was right, but that if the Government adopted this attitude they could not at any rate be reproached with having facilitated Germany's access to Persia.

I told him that our messenger arrived on Saturday, and begged him to call on me again after the messenger's arrival, remarking at the same time that if France was really ready to participate, and if it was possible, the line from Enzeli to Tehran might be contributed by Russian financial houses, then he might always count on the possibility of private English firms being found willing to contribute to the remainder. M. Sazonov said that he would wait, but insisted on the importance, both to Russia and to the general, of some arrangement.

The Turkish Government was about to discuss the Bagdad Railway with Britain. It appeared that Turkey had already sounded Germany as to approaching the Turkish Government and the attitude of Turkey and Germany in this matter was one of the consequences which had resulted from the meeting at Potsdam. His Excellency added that he was unable to understand why Great Britain, if her requirements as to the Gulf section were about to be satisfied, was now taking up the question of the construction of railways in South Persia. I replied by observing that it was by no means certain that her requirements as to the Gulf section would be satisfied.

I venture to hope that it may be found possible to furnish me with instructions before next Saturday, the 18th February.

5394]

No. 96

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, February 17, 1911

On the Russian Ambassador to-day of the substance of your telegram No. 5394, and of my telegram in reply.

I explained to him that our great difficulty would be to induce British capital to invest in any railway in Persia without a Government guarantee. British capital could not be expected to do for Russian trade in the north of Persia what it would not do for British trade in the south.

The idea that the Russian Government might be unable to give a guarantee for the proposed railway in the north of Persia was new to Count Benckendorff.

I also told him that M. Sazonov apparently thought that he could not negotiate with Germany until the Russian railway in the north was completed.

I reminded Count Benckendorff that I had stated at the beginning of these discussions about the Potsdam negotiations that it would be a great pity if the Russian negotiations with Germany were broken off as it would certainly make the relations between Russia and Germany difficult.

Count Benckendorff was fully alive to this consideration.

I took the opportunity of saying to Count Benckendorff with what great relief I had heard the news of the withdrawal of Russian troops from Kazvin.

I am, Sir,  
Yours faithfully,  
E. Grey

4218]

No. 97

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

No. 47.]

Foreign Office, February 16, 1911

I took an opportunity of telling the Russian Ambassador to-day that the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs had spoken more than once to Sir Gerard Lowther on the subject of the Bagdad Railway, and had said that he expected soon to be able

to put proposals in writing. But we had not so far received any written proposals, and we were therefore not yet negotiating. We had, however, expressed our willingness for them to be put forward.

that the Turks had presumably made an arrangement with Germany which would empower them to negotiate with us.

and that I assumed that they were discussing the matter with Germany, but they had not yet told us definitely that Germany had given them a free hand to negotiate with us as they pleased about the section from Bagdad to the Gulf which was the important question.

I am, Sir,  
Yours faithfully,  
E. Grey

5738

No. 98

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, February 16, 1911

IN view of the fact that the Russian Government are not willing to provide either a guarantee for railway from Enzeli to Tehran, we have been asked by Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs for assurance that British capital would be forthcoming. Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs states that M. Piebon has given sympathetic reply as regards French capital, and you should ask him what the prospect is.

If the French Government can get Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs out of his difficulty on this point I shall be delighted, but I do not believe British capital can be induced to invest in any Persian railway without a guarantee.

5574]

No. 99

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, February 16, 1911

Your telegram No. 5574, stating that the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs was willing to receive the Turkish proposals for consideration, and you may inform Minister for Foreign Affairs.

5930.

No. 100

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

On the occasion of conversation to-day (February 16, 1911) about the Christmas holidays, I had held out the expectation that after the Cabinet had considered a reply would be sent to the German Chancellor's memorandum. He asked whether I could give him any further information.

I said that we had already sent a reply about the exchange of naval information, and I had sent that without waiting for the Cabinet to meet, as Count Moternich had

told me that this was decidedly a matter which could be discussed independently of political discussion. You had already had a conversation with the German Chancellor about it.

Count Moternich said that he had lately heard that a communication had been received on that point.

As to the larger question, I told him, internally and privately, that the week before last I had drafted something which I thought might be given to the German Chancellor in the form of a memorandum of conversation, as the German Chancellor had given a communication to you. My absence last week, and that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had delayed matters a little. But the draft would be considered by the Cabinet now, and I hoped to be able to send the communication soon. I also told him that it would advance matters a little further.

I saw nothing in what the German Government had stated on definite points, such as the Bagdad Railway or railways in Persia, that should prevent an agreement



between us. In Persia we had special political interests, not because we desired to push our own political influence, but because we did not wish to see the *status quo* disturbed in a way which might alter the political situation to our disadvantage. But this *status quo* did not, in our view, comprise exclusive commercial arrangements; and if, as I understood, the object of the German Government in Persian affairs was purely commercial and not political, I did not see why our respective commercial interests should not be susceptible of agreement.

Count Metternich entirely assented to the statement that German interests in Persia were commercial and not political.

He then asked me whether I had much news from Turkey, he mentioned troubles in the Yemen and finally asked whether anything was passing with Turkey about the Persian Gulf.

I said that Rifaat Pasha had informed us confidentially that he hoped to make proposals to us about the Bagdad Railway. We had expressed our willingness to receive and consider whatever proposals he made. But these conversations were as yet, and no doubt Rifaat Pasha had kept the German Government informed of them. Our reply to the German Chancellor probably touched upon the question of the Bagdad Railway, and it was a little difficult to know whether we were to negotiate with Germany or with Turkey.

I am, &c.

5542

No. 101

Sir Edward Grey to Sir Edgar Speyer

Foreign Office, February 16, 1911

Your proposal to try to obtain and sell stock which go to make up the 11,000,000 of the German loan to Turkey.

It is not in my power to control the operations of the British money market, and I cannot therefore give advice on the subject.

I am, &c.

E. G. Grey

(8284)

No. 102

The Earl of Cress to Government of India—(communicated by letter February 17)

Telegraphic

RAILWAY

India Office, February 16, 1911

Please refer to telegram dated the 3rd May, 1910, from your predecessor. Telegram was sent on the 13th February, 1911, to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran, to the following effect:—

(Already printed. See "Secret Series" print, February 1, Section I (5647).)

Your views on general question should be communicated as soon as possible by telegram. Propriety of railway guarantee to be shared by Treasury should especially be considered by you. Proposals made in the telegram from Sir E. Grey to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran are connected not with the scheme for a railway but with situation created by Bagdad Railway. Lines of primary importance should be selected, as it seems necessary to avoid frightening the Persian Government by making too large a demand.

[5955]

No. 103

Sir P. Bertin to Sir Edward Grey—(Received February 17.)

No. 103  
Telegraphic, P

Paris, February 17, 1911.

In reference to your telegram No. 37 of the 16th instant, I have the honour to report that I saw M. Pichon to-day, and spoke to him in regard to the prospect of French financial assistance for the construction of the proposed Enzeli Teheran railway. M. Pichon told me that, in reply to an enquiry by M. Lavolsky as to whether the French Government would be prepared to facilitate the provision of French capital for this railway without a guarantee from the Russian Government, he had told his Excellency on the 12th instant that he would be personally very glad if the money could be found in Paris, but that it would be impossible to judge whether French syndicates would entertain the Russian proposals until surveys had been made and estimates of costs and other details were examined. If the Russian Government would not give a guarantee, some other security would probably have to be provided.

M. Pichon thinks that concessions of some kind might be found to afford the requisite security.

5956

No. 104

Sir P. Bertin to Sir Edward Grey—(Received February 17.)

Secret  
Telegraphic, P

Paris, February 17, 1911.

In the course of an interview with M. Pichon to-day his Excellency told me the Russian Ambassador had spoken to him on the 12th instant on the subject of London interviews. M. Lavolsky said on that occasion that he knew that it had been thought in London that some secret agreement had been come to between Russia and Germany at Potsdam, and he enquired whether the French Government entertained any such view. If such were the case, M. Lavolsky said he was instructed to give the French Government, the most solemn assurance that the Russian Government had made no arrangements beyond those which had been communicated by the Russian Government to the Government of the

Pichon replied that the French Government did not suspect their ally of having concluded with Germany any secret agreement which had not been divulged to them, but, at the same time, they considered it regrettable that the Russian Government had not taken them into their confidence before the arrangements with Germany were negotiated by M. Sazonov.

M. Pichon told me that M. Lavolsky had then said that he hoped that should the French Government be informed of their progress, and that he had replied that he would be very glad to be so. M. Lavolsky had suggested

576

No. 105

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, February 17, 1911

It appears to be so many inconsistencies in M. Sazonov's statements, that a critical explanation of my views on certain points which appear to be clear at the moment. I fear more to your telegram No. 39 of the 16th February.

1. As far as has advanced so far, I entirely agree that a failure of negotiations between Russia and Germany would be politically disastrous.

2. The Russian Government are naturally in a better position than anyone else to weigh the disadvantage of giving Khabankuh Teheran line to Germany. We can hardly press objection if the Russian Government feel it necessary and can reconcile it with

their interests, provided that, as regards other matters arising out of Anglo-Russian agreement, they keep their hands free to co-operate with us.

B. Without some guarantee I cannot hold out prospect of British capital being willing to invest in Persian railways. That French capital should do so either would be doubtful.

C. As regards the Baghdad Railway, we do not yet know if we are going to get what we want, nor will a satisfactory settlement of this question prevent British trade from remaining dependent on line from Baghdad to Khankin, and possibly from Khankin to Tehran controlled by Germany. The acquisition of independent means of access by railways in South Persia, constructed under conditions which secure equal commercial advantages, may become an important question for us.

D. In order to prevent railway projects in South Persia from falling a prey to other hands, His Majesty's Government desire to take up the question of the

the substance of the above has been communicated to the Russian Ambassador, who, in answer, adding that I summed up the

M. Sazonow must confirm his promise that a branch from Khankin to Tehran shall be made, and that Russia must decide whether she will make the line herself or get it made by foreign capital, or leave it to Germany to make it. This question will have to be already decided

the time when, some years hence, the promise has to be fulfilled.

6029

No. 106

The Earl of Curzon to Government of India.—(Received at Foreign Office, February 18)

Foreign Office, India Office, February 18, 1911.

KOWEIT. Please expedite your reply to my telegram of the 25th January, as subject will shortly be broached by the Turkish Government. A scheme has been indicated by the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, under which the Gulf section of the railway, though remaining Ottoman, would be internationalised, the shares being

Control of the port, as defined in the 4th condition of my telegram above referred to, would presumably be considered essential by you.

6086

No. 107

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 18)

St. Petersburg, February 18, 1911.

Your telegram No. 66, Secret, of the 15th

I saw M. Sazonow today, and his Excellency told me that his revised draft of the agreement had virtually been accepted by the Council of Ministers. The articles as

telegram No. 73 of 11th February, are recorded as follows:

Article 2 begins: "Rural railways in North Persia." The remainder of the article reading as before.

In addition has been made in order to satisfy Russia. The following has been added as a fourth article:

In the event of Russia waiving her rights in the matter of the connecting line mentioned in article 2 in favour of other concessions, the terms of the agreement will not be affected thereby."

This article is added in order to obviate the danger of Germany repudiating the agreement in the event of Russia ceding her right to construct the railway to an international syndicate.

M. Sazonow pointed out that the present formula would allow Russia time to make whatever financial arrangements might commend themselves to her, and he therefore

proposed to say nothing to Germany about the possibility of French or English participation. He added that he hoped that the Council of Ministers and the Emperor would now give their final sanction, and that he would in a few days be able to hand the revised draft.

6087

No. 108

London to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 18)

(Telegraphic.) P. St. Petersburg, February 18, 1911.

RAILWAYS in Persia.

Your telegrams Nos. 32 to Tehran and 35 to me.

M. Sazonow this afternoon, and communicated to him your views as to delay construction in the north of Persia. He asked whether His Majesty's Government were contemplating the construction of any special line, and I said that no

been arrived at on this point, but that I expected to hear shortly

from you on this.

At the same time, I thought it well to remind M. Sazonow of the favourable view which he had expressed

Khankin. I said I was glad there had been no

presumed that the latter line would be as favourably regarded by him as the other

in supporting the idea of the Mohammereh-Khankin line.

He stated by the opinion that the construction of that line would put it

to that of the Gulf section of the Bagdad Railway. The probability of such a line

being eventually constructed had been brought to his notice in a telegram. This

gram he had submitted to the Council of Ministers, and the Council had approved

project on the same grounds—that its realisation would check the construction of

Gulf section of the Bagdad Railway. At the same time, the Ministers of Commerce

and Finance had pointed out that, if the Gulf section of the Bagdad Railway were to

be constructed, it would not regard the Mohammereh-Khankin line with

equal favour.

that these two Ministers would object to the scheme for a line running from Mohammereh

in a due northerly direction. British railway interests, he would have thought, lay

further to the south.

I then let the subject drop, but, in view of M. Sazonow's remarks, I think it would

be well, before taking any steps for surveying the trace of the M.

Khankin line, to obtain the assent of the Russian Government.

5956

No. 109

Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie.

Foreign Office, February 18, 1911.

Re your telegram No. 11 of the 17th February, you might

mention confidentially to M. Picot that we had no suspicion of the character

indicated by Russian Ambassador at Paris. We admit that M. Sazonow has been

quite frank with us as to his difficulties, though we think he entangled himself too far

at Potsdam.

6648

No. 110

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan.

Foreign Office, February 18, 1911.

MR. ST. BENCE-SPOFFE spoke to me to-day about a guarantee for the

Tehran-Khankin railway, saying that evidently it had been a British guarantee which

M. Sazonow had had.

I said that of course it was out of the question that there should be a British

guarantee for a railway in the north of Persia or for the Tehran-Khankin line, for the

other places in which we were directly interested,

would certainly have priority.



He then asked whether we would join in an international guarantee.  
I replied that, if Russia, France, and Germany were all to guarantee the Teheran-Khamkin line, I personally should be in favour of joining in that guarantee, because I should then judge the matter, not as a commercial question, but as a means of agreement. I could not, however, commit the Government, or do more than express my own personal opinion, at this stage.

I am, &c  
E. GREY

6159

No. 111

*Letter to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 20)*

(No. 95.)

Sir,

*Constantinople, February 11, 1911*

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's Consul General at Beirut, reporting on the arrangements for the transport of 120,000 tons of rails for the Bagdad Railway by the new French Tripoli-Hama line to Aleppo.

I have, &c

GERALD LOWTHER

*Enclosure in No. 111*

*Undersigned Lumber Merchant, Sir G. Lowther*

*Beirut, February 2, 1911*

I HAVE the honour to report that Mr. Acting Vice-Consul Harris Meissner Postel, the engineer of the Bagdad Railway Company, visited Tripoli towards the middle of January in connection with a contract between his society and the French Railway Company for the transport of 120,000 tons.

Aleppo as soon as the Tripoli-Hama section is finished and in working order.

Stores he now have also been rented for the use of the Bagdad Railway. Preparations are being made to build a stone quay for loading the goods that arrive from

are taken as indicating an intention on the part of the Bagdad Railway Company to proceed actively with the last section of the line, and to use Aleppo as a base of operations.

I understand that the contract price for the carriage of the rails was high, and that in both fixing this and the rent for the stores at Tripoli none of the usual German frugal characteristics.

I am, &c  
H. A. CRAMER-KRATOCH

16164

*Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 20)*

(No. 100. (cont. 16164))

Sir,

*Paris, February 14, 1911*

2nd edition, I have the honour to  
to me regarding the negotiations  
and the Bagdad Railway

nor for any  
of the proceeds of the 4 per cent. customs increase, nor for the sums to be derived from  
the proposed tobacco tax, nor from the monopolies which it was contemplated

establishing. He hoped then that the conditions laid down by His Majesty's Government, that the receipts from the 4 per cent. should not be devoted either directly or indirectly to the Bagdad Railway, would thus be complied with. I observed

this question had always been that we could not agree to  
at, on our goods without our being able to point  
go for our traders in another direction. To this his Excellency  
and said he thought we should find it in what he would propose later on.

The company would then depend for the future sections on the revenues which had  
set aside for the early sections, which, with some sacrifice on its part, would  
prove sufficient for the completion of the final sections to Bagdad.

It may also be that such large economies have been made on the building of the  
early sections that the balance will be sufficient for the final sections which, once the  
railway arrives at Aleppo, will be comparatively easy of construction. Refaat Pasha  
went on to say that the company would be allowed to divert the present trace of the  
line to Alexandretta, which concession it has always endeavoured to obtain but  
which the staff of the army had invariably objected. On the other hand, and this was  
the basis of the whole arrangement, the company would give up its rights to the  
building of the Bagdad-Persian Gulf section. His Excellency said that he had

at what we required was that our commercial interests in the  
Gulf and Mesopotamia should be safeguarded, and that we feared that w  
The Persian Gulf section to fall into the hands of a third Power, our in  
might be endangered. The Ottoman Government would consequently suggest  
though the line would remain Ottoman, that section should be

Although Russia took an interest in the line, she would certainly not put any  
into it. The terminus of the line could be either Basorah, w  
could, without undue expenditure, be made into a good

that the terminus of an Ottoman Railway could only be in Ottoman territory,  
if Koweit were eventually decided upon, some justification of the present  
industrial status quo would be necessary, and he hoped in view of the desire which

friendly relations, that a satisfactory  
question would become possible. The Ottoman Government  
would, of course, should the plan which he had outlined take shape, be prepared to give  
undertaking in writing that Koweit should never be alienated to a third Power. His  
Excellency said also that the port of Koweit should in his proposed plan also be built  
syndicate as the railway.

Excellency said that later on he would be prepared to lay these proposals  
in writing, but he begged that in the meantime they should be regarded as

He would, however, take an early opportunity of communicating to the French  
the conditions under which the Ottoman Government were negotiating  
Railway, and his plans for the eventual settlement of the  
question.

I have, &c

GERALD LOWTHER

61701

No. 113

*Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 20)*

(No. 106.)

Sir,

*Constantinople, February 15, 1911.*

N. N. today, I stated that Refaat Pasha had said that the  
quired to give Great Britain a written  
lower. It is difficult to see what price could

have, and, to judge by your despatch dated the 20th January to  
Office, it would appear to be rather a question of obtaining, in certain  
contingencies, a reliable undertaking that the internal status quo of the Sheikh  
K. territory should be respected—a condition of things which would seem well  
compatible with the acknowledgment of Turkish sovereignty or sovereignty (as stated

despatch No. 28, Secret, of the 18th January, to Sir P. Baring). Koweit's  
is undefined and has been considerably encroached on by the Turks, especially  
the map attached to volume I of W. G. Palgrave's

1711

Central and Eastern Arabia," where the sheikhs territory marked in difference from that of Turkish and independent Central Arabia in 1865—was sh. forward policy in those parts of Namik and Mu. extending north of Fao. Presumably the land frontier would stipulations made us to the administration on both sides of the line. The whole position prevent Central Government can apparently maintain itself in power only in virtue of the state of siege, and war.

article in the "Tanin," Ismail Hakki Bey Babanzade, deputy for Bagdad, discusses the question of an arrangement with England concerning the Bagdad and the Persian Gulf. He says that, from the Turkish standpoint, "the question is the Persian Gulf, and the Bagdad Railway takes second place." In a recent question, differences and misunderstandings have arisen. In the latter it is only surmised that they may arise; although the sovereignty is established and clear in the Persian Gulf, it is attacked by England at one point, whereas in the matter of the railway even England admits that the sovereignty can not be discussed. He goes on to say that the object of an arrangement cannot be to secure important interests to England or any other power, but to put an end to the rivalry of two Great Powers. "If the matter is judged drawing unlawful profit from the confusion." Turkey, he says, has no such aim, but unfortunately the statements of the most important English papers do not tend to

over the Bagdad

"Any Ottoman statement would be made to negotiate on the basis of control. Perhaps the talk of control is simply a scheme to nullify the negotiations from the start. But never mind, for at any rate part of the dark curtain will have been raised and some of the secret aims disclosed, which is a gain in itself.

if permissible questions had been discussed before this absurd proposal was put forward, a more benevolent attention would have been shown. There is the Russian question and certain other questions which are claimed as solutions of it. There are the treaties concluded with sheikhs. One ought to examine the effect those treaties have on regards third parties. Also the Kuwait question, etc."

Ismail Hakki Bey has raised the question of Bahrain, Katar and the triced ports, if not Muscat, and it would certainly seem probable, if not imperative, to settle definitely the status of those places, especially Turkey, before Turkish pretensions to Kuwait.

I have the honour to receive a translation of an article in the "Hikam," a proposal of an arrangement regarding Kuwait and the Gulf. It is conceived in a more reasonable and friendly spirit, but represents perhaps the non-committal point of view, as opposed to that of Ismail Hakki Babanzade and other such extremists as are now in power. Should the present internal crisis lead to an elimination or change of the dominant element, any discussion with Turkey concerning

GERARD LAWTHEN

Enclosure in No. 113.

Extrait from the "Hikam"

TRAITÉ DE L'ANGLETERRE

LES Puissances s'occupent maintenant de leurs intérêts en Orient ou des intérêts des autres avant en Orient. L'antagonisme entre les Puissances ne s'arrête pas.

La période d'existence que notre vie politique traverse actuellement est très importante au point de vue de la sauvegarde de notre avenir. La moindre faute que nous pourrions commettre aujourd'hui dans notre politique étrangère peut donner lieu

à des conséquences des plus regrettables pour l'avenir. Aucun pays n'a une influence aussi grande que l'Angleterre. Il a donc le droit de s'occuper de ses intérêts en Orient. L'Angleterre et qui amèneront forcément un échange de vues contre les deux Gouvernements que nous devons connaître le plus tôt possible les points de vue de l'Angleterre sur toutes ces questions. Quoique l'Allemagne ou la Russie soient à d'autres points de vue, regardées comme plus fortes que l'Angleterre, la diplomatie anglaise est, pour nous, plus importante que toutes les autres. Car c'est le Gouvernement anglais qui pourra jouer le plus grand rôle politique en Orient.

Nous proposons aux diplomates qui ne sont pas convaincus de ce rôle de l'Angleterre les résultats politiques qui découleraient de la conclusion d'une entente avec la grande Puissance. Nous croyons que l'Allemagne, la plus grande puissance de l'Angleterre dans les domaines du commerce et des finances, les propositions que l'Angleterre pourrait lui faire de nous envoie elle il faut nous

Edward Grey avait fait press

pour parler sans hésitation.

à production de la "Vossische Zeitung," qui, en réponse au journal se produisant entre l'Angleterre et la Russie. Nous sommes sûrs que si nous

6356

No. 114

Sir G. Barclay to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 20.)

Tehran February 20, 1911.

#### RAILWAYS

I concur in the course indicated in first three paragraphs of your telegram No. 113 of the 14th February, but I should prefer not to take action at the present moment. To broach the question of railways at this juncture would, I have good reason to believe, embarrass the Regent and I think it would be better to postpone moving in the matter for a week or two in the hope that Nasr-ul-Mulk will by then be firmly established. At the present moment his Highness is endeavouring to ally the anti-British and anti-Russian feeling in the country, and circumstances may shortly be more favourable for treating the railway question.

I would recommend, after consultation with Colonel Cox, that when His Majesty's Government decide to apply for the Muhammad Shah Kharrenshah concession I should be authorised to approach Persian Government and to inform sheikh as soon as application has been made, as I fear Persian Government would resent alternative

It appears to me highly desirable that Lieutenant Wilson's services should now be utilised for a survey of the sections outside the Russian zone. Colonel Cox telegraphs that since he wrote his despatch No. 2611 of the 2nd October to Government of India conditions have become more promising than he anticipated. Improvement may be only temporary, and Wilson should be authorised to start immediately if he is to undertake the

With regard to risk which will attend Wilson's journey, there appears no likelihood to judge, after he has stayed a little at Duxford, of the advisability of persevering, delay which has elapsed will, however, make it impossible for him to obtain

consul-general and he will have to use his discretion in the matter.

I agree with His Majesty's consul-general in thinking that no useful object could be served by consulting Persian Government with regard to the proposed railway. If they might try to obstruct, they could not in any case assist or protect.



5158]

No. 115

(No. 11.)

Sir,

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 33 of the 9th instant, reporting the steps which have taken place between yourself and the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs relative to the negotiations in progress between Germany and Russia respecting the Bagdad Railway and railway construction in Persia.

The language held by your Excellency to M. Sazonov

I am, &  
F. GREY

6520]

No. 116

163

Telegraphic) P.  
112

St. Petersburg, February 21, 1911

4th February

On receipt of the draft of the agreement, in the form in which it was shown to me on Saturday last, was handed to the German Ambassador to-day. In handing it to Count Pourtales, M. Sazonov expressed to his Excellency the hope that it would be accepted as stood, and that the German Government would not propose any alterations which were not of a purely verbal character. Count Pourtales offered no objection, and reciprocated the hope expressed by M. Sazonov.

M. Sazonov addressed enquiries to me as to our negotiations with the Turkish Government. I think it would have a tranquillising effect on him if I were able to tell him that His Majesty's Government would keep him in the course of these negotiations. I see that some such assurance has been given to the Ambassador in Paris by the French Government. (Sir F. Hartie's telegram of the 17th February.)

6356]

No. 117.

Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(No. 31.)

(Telegraphic) P.

Foreign Office, February 21, 1911

I AUREE in postponement as suggested in your telegram No. 53 of the 20th February.

You should in no case make any move without further instructions, as we have not yet learnt views of Government of India.

I should like to know whether you consider Mohammareh line to be of greatest importance to British commerce, or whether, in this connection, you prefer other

6356

No. 118

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(No. 63.)

(Telegraphic) P.

Foreign Office, February 21, 1911

LIEUTENANT WILSON'S survey. Your telegram No. 43.

For that we should obtain Russian concurrence before giving Wilson

Of course, no survey would be undertaken in Russian sphere

5542

No. 119

Sir E. Spreyer to Sir Edward Grey — (Received February 22)

Sir Edward,

7, Lombury, London, February 20, 1911

I AM obliged for your letter of the 16th, in which you write "It is not in my power to control the operations of the British money market."

I am afraid the language and purport of my letter must have been misunderstood.

What I sought to obtain from you was a statement that the Foreign Office would not continue to discontinue the issue of Turkish bonds in this country.

If the Foreign Office approved of such issue the British public would not be asked by my firm to subscribe.

As your letter is silent on this point, from which any approval cannot, in any of such be inferred, no attempt will be made to secure the option, and no issue will be made by my firm.

If the British public desire to invest in a new Turkish loan, they will have to apply to Germany or France, with the result that the preponderating financial interest in Turkish matters will certainly not be lost in this country.

Very truly  
FOUCAULT

6669

No. 120

to Sir Edward Grey — (Received February 22)

10th February 1911

in No. 63 of the 21st February

about M. Sazonov before beginning the survey of the line he may think, after his recent remarks to me, that we are not acting straightforwardly by him. I am, therefore, strongly of opinion that he should first be consulted. In our recent conversations, he has repeatedly referred to our approaching negotiations with Berlin to give me the impression of suspecting that

and from him

the German Government stated in the *re-actement* of the 14th August, 1908, that some arrangement would have to be made to prevent the railway from Julla Mohammareh which was then being discussed, from affecting injuriously the interests of Russia in North Persia. I think, therefore, that it would be well to inform M. Sazonov that the survey which we now desire to make is only a preliminary one. That we should come to an understanding with the Russian Government before

6520

No. 121

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

Foreign Office, February 22, 1911

with regard to Bagdad Railway

As yet we have received no definite proposals on the subject (see your telegram No. 16 of the 21st February), though we have informed the Turkish Government that we are willing to consider any which may be made in writing. Your Excellency will be kept posted on the subject for Minister for Foreign Affairs information.

5542.

No. 122

Edward Grey to Sir Edgar Speyer

(Private)

Dear Sir Edgar Speyer,

Foreign Office, February 22, 1911

Your reply to my letter seems to imply that I must have some responsibility for

The object of my letter was to say that I could not undertake responsibility for

this I must adhere.

Yours very truly,

E. GREY

66881

No. 12

Sir P. Butler to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 22)

No. 862

Sir,

Paris, February 22

With reference to my despatch No. 77 of the 18th instant, I have the pleasure to inform you that in the waiting-room at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs today, the Russian Ambassador referred, in conversation with the German Ambassador, to French newspaper habits, and stated that "La Libre Parole" had published an interview with him which had never taken place.

I have &amp;c

FRANÇOIS HENRI

6702

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 23)

(19 Secret)

Telegraphic P.

St. Petersburg, Feb.

Your telegram No. 60 of the 23rd February. Railways in doubt

In accordance with your instructions, I made a communication on the subject to M. Sazonov, who expressed his thanks. He made no comment, but only remarked that the report which had reached him as to a scheme for building a line from Mohammedih to Khankin was presumably unfounded.

71511

No. 125

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. (Received February 23)

(No. 14. Secret.)

Sir,

St. Petersburg, February 21, 1911

SINCE the departure of the last messenger the Russo-German negotiations have been advanced a stage, and M. Sazonov has at last, after much hesitation and after repeatedly changing his position, succeeded in remodeling the draft agreement and his colleagues' introduction. The difficulties with which he has during the past fortnight have proceeded not so much from the side of the opposition which some of his proposals

In my despatch No. 37 of the 9th February I received from the Russian Ambassador in London an account of the wishes of the present of taking more account of the wishes of the Russian Government. Such an impression indeed did these telegrams make on him that after pondering over the matter for forty-eight hours, his Excellency sent for me and protested in an agitated and reproachful tone that his attitude with regard to the Tehran-Khankin Railway had been completely misunderstood by His Majesty's Government. Had he not, he said, explained to us both before and after Potsdam that the possession of this line was a matter of vital moment to Russia? Why

at over it, in a way that we had never done over the Baghdad Railway. Could I tell him what had happened? Had Count Benckendorff, who excited, exaggerated matters? He had hoped that Sir A. Nicholson, who knew the Russo-German negotiations so well, would have had more confidence in him, but he feared from the latter's language to Count Benckendorff that this was not the case. He was aware that much of the uneasiness felt at Paris on the subject was due to the fact that the French Ambassador had misrepresented him and had given his Government to understand that he had actually broached the question of the cession of the line to Germany with Count Pourtales.

He said that His Majesty's Government perfectly understood the special position of the line with regard to the line in question, but that they did not wish to see it pass into German hands. I had never told His Majesty's Government that he had submitted to Count Pourtales a proposal for its cession, but I had felt it to warn them that such a cession was an eventuality with which they should be confronted. I reminded his Excellency of all that he had said to me.

The difficulty which prevented Russia engaging to construct the line herself and asked what other means she had in mind, and I said I had not left on me but that I was only contemplating this step. All that M. Sazonov was able to answer was that it was not he, but the Minister of Commerce, who had in the Council of Ministers decided that as the line would only further Germany's economic interests, it was better that she should bear the cost of its construction. He had personally always advocated keeping the control in Russian hands, and had even endeavored to effect an arrangement with which Russia would have participated to the extent of 60 per cent. The fact that it was not possible to build for another six years would have given him time to get over the financial difficulty.

I did not think it necessary to continue the discussion further, as I had already observed that any other discussion which might have been felt in London would have been set at rest.

On the 23rd instant, in which I had reported my last communication to him what I had said in the

telegram, M. Sazonov remarked that I had exactly expressed his views, though I subsequently attempted to deduce from a conversation which Count Benckendorff had had on the previous day with Mr. Tyrrell, on the subject of British participation, that our fears were not yet allayed. I reassured him on this point; and

added to impress on him the importance of our saying nothing either in diplomatic circles respecting the idea of the participation of British money, and in the Persian-Khankin line, for fear of its getting to Germany.

On the same subject, his Excellency, somewhat unexpectedly, said that he would give me the promissory of the revised text of the draft agreement, although it had

been submitted earlier to the Council of Ministers or to the Emperor. He could not at the moment make a copy of it, as he wanted to be in two positions to say to Germany, should the text again be divulged, that the only copies in existence were in the possession of the two Ministers for Foreign Affairs. He would, however, allow me to read it. I thanked his Excellency for this proof of confidence, and I had subsequently the honour to forward to you a summary of its contents in my telegram No. 38 of the 11th instant.

I called again on M. Sazonov on the 13th instant to convey to him your thanks and appreciation of the friendly communication which he had made to me. He

was much pleased with this message, but said that a fresh Council of Ministers had objected to the engagement which

he had made to the construction of the Tehran-Khankin line.

He said that the Russian public would denounce the Government for spending money on a railway which was to open the Persian markets to German trade before they had taken any steps to provide for the construction of a railway in the north which would render a similar service to Russian goods. He thought that a line from Russia to Tehran would suffice to tranquillize public opinion, but unfortunately the Duma would never allow the Russian Government to give a guarantee for any railway in Persia while railways were so urgently needed in the interior of Russia. He must therefore appeal to Paris and London for financial assistance, and he hoped that the bankers who were interested themselves in the Tehran-Khankin line would be disposed to take up the northern line as well. The line from Elazeh to Tehran

would constitute the first section of the trans-Persian railway.

On the other hand, the respective advantage, was likely to prove a more profitable one for the Tehran-Khankin line. While the two lines might be treated as one as far as financial arrangements for their construction were concerned, complete secrecy must be observed with regard to the latter until after the publication of the Russo-German agreement.



replied that his Excellency might meet this new difficulty by announcing simultaneously with the publication of the above-mentioned agreement, that the Russian Government were taking steps to obtain from the Persian Government a concession for a line from Kizil to Tehran. The question of financing the line could, I thought, be left for future discussion. M. Sazonow replied that he could not ask for the concession until he was sure of being able to find the necessary capital, as it was most important that this line should be commenced as soon as possible, so as to forestall any line from Kizil to Teheran.

On the receipt of your telegram No. 49 of the 14th instant, I informed M. Sazonow that, without a guarantee on the part of the Russian Government it would be difficult for us to induce British capital to participate in either of these railways. We were ourselves considering the question of the construction of railways in Southern Persia for the promotion of our economic interests, that we might eventually have to consider the question of a guarantee; and that we could not do in Northern Persia what it would probably refuse to do in Southern Persia, viz. to give a Government guarantee. This communication seemed to depress his Excellency. M. Pichon he said had taken a more hopeful and optimistic view of the question, and he did not attempt to conceal his disagreement with our answer. He had, he said, promised to hand Count Pourtales a draft of the agreement by the end of the week, and

did not see how he could now prevent the Tehran-Khankin line passing into the hands of Germany. I said that he could do this by adhering to the formula which he had inserted in his new draft, and by obtaining at the same time a concession for the Kizil-Tehran line, or by reverting to the formula that I had originally suggested to him, under which Russia would reserve the right of inviting the participation of foreign capital. It was quite unnecessary to hand over the railway to Germany straight off. It would be time enough to do so if, in a few years' time, he found it impossible to raise the necessary capital either at home or in Paris and London. He should remember

that Russia's refusal either to give a Government guarantee or to give a quota of the capital, might entail the renunciation of her policy of railway construction in Persia and the consequent loss of her influence and prestige. M. Sazonow replied that he was aware of this, but he feared that the Council of Ministers would not accept either of the alternatives of which I had spoken. They would be said to be "too" were they to contribute to an undertaking which would open the door to German goods in the south and leave it shut to Russian trade in the north. That was one thing, on the other hand, he reproached should the line be constructed it would be entirely kept entirely aloof from it. He said that he would do nothing till I saw him again after the autumn

When M. Sazonow observed that it was most important both in the interests of Russia and of Persia that an agreement should be arrived at between Russia and Germany. Sir Arthur Nicolson had given Count Pourtales to understand that Turkey was about to approach us on the subject of the Bagdad Railway. M. Sazonow would have been very glad to see us without first ascertaining himself that it was approved at Berlin and he thought that this more friendly disposition on the part of the German and Turkish Governments was the indirect result of the Potsdam interview. His Excellency evinced considerable curiosity with regard to the line, which the approaching negotiations were to be conducted, and concluded by saying that if we were going to get all we wanted with regard to the Gulf section, we must not understand why we were now taking up the question of railways in South Persia. I replied that His Majesty's Government were as anxious as his Excellency that the line should be brought to a satisfactory conclusion, but that, as we were not certain that we should obtain what we wanted relative to it.

When I saw M. Sazonow on the 18th instant after the receipt of your telegram of the 15th, I was agreeably surprised to find that his Excellency had overcome the opposition of his colleagues to the wording of article 2, which deals with the Tehran-Khankin Railway, by inserting a few lines at the commencement of the article to allay any apprehensions that might be felt here with regard to the railway. M. Sazonow allowed me to read once more the revised text of the agreement in what he gave me to understand would be its final form. It now consists of a preamble and four articles.

The preamble records the principle of commercial equality, recognises Russia's special commercial interests in Persia, and ascribes a purely commercial character to the interests

Article 1 is a revised reproduction of the 4th article of the Convention of 1888, which I was able to detect was the omission of the words "of a territorial character".

Article 2 reads, as far as I can remember, as follows:—

"The Russian Government, having the intention of securing from the Government of the Shah the concession for the construction of a system of railways in the north, wishes to obtain simultaneously a concession for a linking-up line for the Sadiq-Khankin Railway (without Tehran being specified as the junction), when that branch of the Komish-Baghdad Railway shall have been completed."

Article 3 states that Russia will place no obstacles in the way of "cette" though she cannot be required to make any financial sacrifices. In this article M. Sazonow showed me on the 10th instant the Komish-Baghdad Railway was, I am not mistaken, referred to as "the above-mentioned railway"—or words to that effect. The article concludes with a revised version of the 3rd article respecting the railways to the north of Khankin, Germany engaging to lend her material or diplomatic support to any such enterprise without a previous understanding with the Russian Government.

Article 4 is to the following effect:—

"Should the Russian Government waive, in favour of other concessionnaires, its rights with regard to the linking-up line provided for in article 2, all the other stipulations of the present agreement shall remain in force."

The object of the above article is to guard against the danger of Germany repudiating her obligations under the agreement in the event of Russia ceding her rights with regard to the Tehran-Khankin line to any third party. M. Sazonow

possible participation of French and British capital. The formula which he was now using would give him a perfectly free hand and enable him to make what arrangements he liked when the time came. It was probable, he thought, that Germany would insist on inserting in the 2nd article, after the words "simultaneously a concession for," the words "and to proceed with the construction of," but this was a small matter to which he would raise no objection.

In the course of our conversation his Excellency reverted once more to the question of our railways in South Persia, and enquired whether we had any particular objection to the line from Kizil to Khankin. I told him that, though I expected a

motion, as nothing whatever had been decided, I had not spoken to me strongly a few weeks before from Mohammereh to Khankin. So far as I was certain, no such project had ever been put forward, but I believed that Mohammereh to Khankin had been spoken of, and I presumed that this project would find equal favour with his Excellency. M. Sazonow replied that he had done as he had done in favour of a Mohammereh-Khankin railway because he considered that such a line would strike a death-blow to the prolongation of the Bagdad Railway to the Gulf. The Council of Ministers, to whom he had communicated what he had heard on the subject, had approved the project on the same grounds. The Ministers of Finance and Commerce had however, remarked that two such parallel railways would be *de trop* and he very much doubted whether they would approve of a railway running due north from Mohammereh to the Russian sphere. He would have thought it would be more in our interests to construct railways further south, and he did not see what great advantages we would derive from such a line, as it would run for a considerable distance along the banks of the Karun.

On my calling on his Excellency this afternoon M. Sazonow informed me that he had just handed to the German Ambassador the revised draft of the Russo-German agreement which he had shown me on Saturday. He had, he said, endeavoured to impress on Count Pourtales that he had gone as far as he could to meet the wishes of his Government, and had expressed the hope that the German Government would accept the agreement as it stood and would confine itself to proposing purely verbal alterations. Count Pourtales had reciprocated this wish and had personally raised no objections to the text.

In the course of our further conversation M. Sazonow once more referred to the subject of our approaching negotiations with Turkey. He had, he said, questioned the German Ambassador on the subject, but his Excellency had professed entire ignorance.

I told him that all that I knew was that we had informed the Turkish Ambassador in London that our cars were open to anything that the Turkish Government wished to say to us on the subject of the Bagdad Railway, and that, so far as I was aware, no definite proposals had as yet been submitted to us. I think, however, would be advisable to satisfy his Excellency's curiosity, so far as we could.

I am to the contrary of the 17th instant that Mr. [Name] has no assistance and I fear that if we had to do the same we should be waiting in confidence towards him.

I have, &c.  
GEORGE W. BUCHANAN.

(7150)

No. 126.

Sir to, Letter to Sir Edward Grey, (Received February 27)

No. 126. Confidential  
Sir,

Paris, February 21, 1911

17th instant, I have the honour to send several comments on the subject of the Persian

Embassy for information on the subject have begun, and that when they do their success will not be facilitated by my giving as to the course of their progress. These rumours are in part true, and

members of which are in progress with England, and their success would be endangered by giving or pooling to extremes the present Ministerial crisis. They are thus partly party political manoeuvres. In an interview I had yesterday with the [Name], his Highness had practically nothing to add to Rifaat Pasha's report in my despatch No. 100 of the 14th instant. I informed him, in your telegram No. 40 of the 16th instant, of your readiness to consider proposals that the Ottoman Government might make on the subject. Hakkı Pasha read to Rifaat Pasha's communication, and said that the difficulty was that they not begin negotiations with us until they had settled with the German company the basis of their renunciation of their rights in the Bagdad half sections, a before arriving at such a settlement it was necessary to ascertain and lay down the general nature of the arrangement.

1. He alluded to the preliminary in [Name] Herr Gwinner had discussed matters with

now on the other and expensive sections of the line, and said that Koweit was of course the natural terminus and harbour, but that, if it was impossible to come to a satisfactory arrangement on that point, Basorah would have to become the terminus, despite its obvious drawbacks, and, referring to Koweit, remarked that "England might feel assured that any place she recognised as Turkish would remain Turkish." Hakkı Pasha's use of the word "recognised," if intentional, would seem to indicate his contemplating the possibility of being unable to induce England to recognise the place as Turkish in the committee's acceptance of the word. On the latter point Ismail Hakkı Bey Babanzade, in an article in the "Tanin" of which I have the honour to enclose a translation, gives us the committee's standpoint. He would only allow the sheikh the autonomy of any Mesopotamian Arab tribes, e.g., the Beni Lam, Muntelik, &c., and would insist on having Ottoman police, customs, and gendarmerie in Koweit, thus restoring Ottoman influence, which has suffered some sort of interruption since 1902, to its original condition. He seems conveniently to ignore the fact that that date Turkey can point to no real act of sovereignty in Koweit, e.g., taxes or direct administration in any form. I have before alluded to the [Name] some members of the committee to invite England to refer the matter to arbitration. Ismail Hakkı Bey has had great store by the argument that Sheikh Mutarrak has accepted the exclusively Ottoman title of pasha. It may be well to remember that

Prince Ferdinand also accepted the title of pasha, as Vali of Eastern Roumelia, where there were no Ottoman police, gendarmerie, or customs. The Turkish claim to Koweit, Debar, &c., on the grounds that such places acknowledged Ottoman sovereignty in the sixteenth century is of course preposterous. They have then only the basis of conquest or the madon-sible Islamic basis. The constitution pro-

11. [Name] Pasha conquests. The independent sheikh may subsequently have yielded a semi-religious and semi-temporal allegiance to the Sultan-Caliph, but in 1902 he broke such ties and bound himself to Great Britain. Ismail Hakkı Bey's estimate of Turkish influence previous to 1902 is thus

I understood from Rifaat Pasha to-day that the negotiations with the German company are not proceeding as smoothly as when we last spoke to me; and it may be that when pourparlers with us are actually started Ismail Hakkı Bey and men of his type may be less influential than they are.

I have, &c.  
G. RAYD LOWTHER

I have in No. 126

Printed of Article in the "Tanin" of February,

Discussion about an Entente with England

1911 some time there has been keen anticipation of discussion for bringing about an entente between the Ottoman Government and England concerning the Persian half, the last section of the Bagdad Railway, &c., and the latest information goes to show that the foundation-stone is to be laid by an exchange of views between Rifaat Pasha and Sir Gerard Lowther. The opinion expressed by the former, that important questions ought to be discussed by statesmen and not in the columns of newspapers, is thus confirmed.

1. I go by the unreasoning claims of the "Times" and similar papers, and have no hope of peace between the two parties. But in the more moderate papers there appeared a change full of promise. For

of a novice for England to play an ambitious, grasping role, create her resources, and therefore cannot run up without railways. It is no right of veto over the extension of the Bagdad Railway in the [Name] upon a time many English joint men opposed the Suez Canal project attitude shows us that the sense of what is right is not quite extinguished in the English, which brings us hope and consolation. Nevertheless there are still necessities caused by ignorance. For instance a telegram from London to a French paper says that the English Cabinet will confirm Ottoman sovereign rights over Koweit without difficulty, provided the sheikh's autonomy is respected and the harbour of Koweit is left in English hands. Koweit harbour has nothing to do with England now. Is it to be anglicised as a reward when Turkey has adopted a favourable policy towards England with regard to the last section of the Bagdad Railway? How can the expressions "Ottoman sovereignty" and "English harbour" be reconciled? To tell the truth, the telegram is nonsense, and we think such a scheme is no more likely to be put forward by England than to occur.

The real bone of contention is the Persian Gulf. With regard to the Bagdad Railway, there is no disagreement between the two Powers, and officially there is no; it is a weapon—a dependent question which will serve to settle the [Name] question. We do not know how far our views are shared officially; but if there is anything certain, it is that our consenting to listen to England's aims and objects with regard to the Bagdad Railway is a great favour and sacrifice. There is mutual sacrifice in a bargain; and we ask England for her views on the last section of the Bagdad Railway, and tell her to give up her important position in the K [Name] questions. That is the first foundation-stone of an entente.

We think England is coming round to this view. The object of "control" is now seen to mean preponderant participation in providing the capital, English being a



language which admits of such elasticity. All the row about the word "control" must therefore be attributed to the elasticity of English.

If the matter had been a piece of plain business, there would have been no need for the Ambassador about the railway; there would have been negotiations between the Ministry of Public Works and the company which was willing to provide the capital. But as the real object was the Koweit and Persian Gulf questions, it was felt that diplomatic approval was needed. When the basis of the *entente* has been laid with regard to the political and diplomatic points, the commercial and economic part of the question ought to resume its natural course and to leave the soft outspaw of diplomacy with its hidden claws.

1. The date and form of the convention is this—

First cause of hesitation will be removed by fixing on Koweit as the Bagdad Railway.

2. The Sheikh of Koweit's autonomy will be maintained in accordance with the principles followed with regard to tribes, but as the position of Koweit will increase in importance and delicacy there will have to be police, customs, and gendarmerie in the harbour, and they will be Ottoman. In this way Ottoman influence, which has suffered some sort of interruption since 1802, will return to its original condition. A harbour will have to be built in Koweit, and there is no objection to its being constructed with foreign capital; but the position of the harbour will not differ from that of any other of our harbours which have been constructed.

3. The extraordinary advantage that will be gained by England in putting an end to the doubtful position in which she stands in her mind and not stand of a (unintelligible) will be different for the Bagdad Railway will give it a more definite position. This means that in order to gain the trade of a clearer definition of Turkey's position in Koweit we practically

secure security and life—a bargain in which England is again the gainer. But we allow ourselves to be taken in over this bargain in order to extend our future friendly relations with England. If the "Times" and its like complain at this age of friendship, and Lord Cromer, Lord Lansdowne, and others again sow the seeds of discord by references wounding to Ottoman dignity, England will be harmed not by us but by English statesmen.

[7409]

Box

Government of India to the Lord of Crete.—(Received at Foreign Office, February 27, 1911.)

Telegraphic. P. February 23, 1911.  
PLEASE refer to your telegram dated the 27th ultimo and the 16th instant regarding Koweit. Following telegram, dated the 10th February, received from Resident, Persian Gulf, who was authorised, during visit he was paying to Koweit, to endeavour, without informing the Sheikh of motives, to elicit the latter's views.

"Sheikh has been assured by the present vali, whom he has not yet met, that Turkish Government were ready to grant him a firman guaranteeing to preserve his present position and to abstain altogether from interfering in Koweit government or, as it only he would comply with their wishes by taking out Turkish papers for himself. These overtures, the Sheikh said, he had always rejected (1) because he believed his action in so doing to be in accordance with our wishes, (2) because he thought that an adjustment on either basis of difficulty regarding property would be achieved by us in due course in virtue of our agreement with him. It is his personal belief that he would in future receive fair play in regard to his property, if he placated the Turks by registering his sons. He said that, in his own case, he would not apprehend likelihood that such registration would result ultimately in Turkish interference at Koweit, despite the firman; he felt, moreover, that his engagement with us safeguarded Koweit; but he must in this connection accept our estimate of future possibilities, which he considered British Government were much better able to gauge than himself.

"Sheikh replied in the affirmative to an enquiry whether, in the event of Turkish Government being ready to grant firman in satisfactory terms, and of our obtaining from Porte documentary undertaking of strict observance of firman, he considered that he would be rendered quite secure.

"Above means would appear to provide sufficient recognition of Turkish sovereignty to satisfy Turkish Government, and provided our engagements with the Sheikh held good and were reaffirmed, it would apparently not be resented by himself.

"With regard to suggested payment of tribute by Sheikh, it is correct to say that tribute never has been paid by Sheikh of Koweit. Receipt of coin, honorary title of *kaznakam*, annual presents of dates from Bassorah, [authorities?] and sending of voluntary co-operation, such as that rendered in 1871 to Mirhat Pasha, at a time of emergency, have been the extent of indications of Koweit Sheikh's dependence on Turkey. There might be a tacit resumption of these in the which existed in 1898, but I earnestly deprecate any suggestions of payment of tribute which would seem unnecessary and unexpected. Sheikh would greatly resent any such suggestion, and in impression created amongst other Arab Sheikh's in relations with us would be of worst possible character.

"Suggestion No. (4), effective control by land as well as by sea, as in Egypt, is, I presume, meant by 'control of port'. Unless if we did not control last section of the railway, frontier light was an immense impracticability.

Questions of extraterritoriality, &c., would necessarily arise. It would require serious consideration of railway and large commercial port with foreign houses, and a more overhauled administration, over which British Government would deal with foreign Powers on Sheikh's behalf, must exercise supervision. There have to be substituted for a rude regime of Sheikh.

Stipulation that Waris, Bulayan, and I'm Kuer be recognised as in Sheikh's sphere of control, and removal of present Turkish guards, should be included in any recognition of Turkish suzerainty.

"Stipulation would also appear to be necessary that definite date at which the terminus should be specific condition of recognition. If this stipulation is made, it would be open to Germany, on our part, to say that most convenient place for terminus

location, to be at Basra or Bassorah. It must be noted that it might have been found necessary by us, in connection with requirements of oil trade or railway from Mosulmarah to Juffa, to dredge the bar at Bagdad Railway reaches Persian Gulf.

"It is clear, moreover, that transference of large customs duties and transit duty now rendered by Turks at Bassorah to Sheikh of Koweit's pocket will not be agreed to without consent to get bulk of customs

fair division will thus be assured at Koweit not Bassorah, is to be made. Selection of terminus, it would seem, will be consideration which will mainly influence selection.

"I consider that opening of railway negotiations, if not long deferred, may be awaited before Federal question is settled.

"Change of policy is involved by proposal of His Majesty's Government, and it is earnestly recommended that nothing in our position should be surrendered until (1) predominant control, say 60 per cent. of capital and control as minimum, is secured by us in section of railway from Bagdad to Koweit, (2) absolute control of harbour and port of Koweit, by land and sea, is shared by us with Sheikh.

As a corollary, it is further urged that, before negotiations as to suzerainty are entered upon, it should be ascertained that Koweit shall be territorial. Resident's views have my general support, provided these essential conditions can be secured. Preferably no question of payment of tribute should be raised, all that is required would seem to be an arrangement under which customs receipts at Koweit are divided between Turks and Sheikh, to compensate the former for losses of revenue at Bassorah. It is also assumed that our own agreements with Sheikh will not be invalidated by recognition of Turkish suzerainty.

7212]

No. 138.

Sir G. Barclay to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 27)

(No. 68)

(Telegraphic) P

Tehran, February 27, 1911

RAILWAYS. Reference to your telegram No. 54, dated the 21st February. Of the proposed railways in Southern Persia, British trade would, I think, benefit most by the Mohammereh Khoremsabad line. Developments in Bagdad Railway and in Russian railway construction in the north would, of course, determine the degree of its usefulness.

A direct route would be provided to the district, of which the distributing centre is Hamadan, from where 40 per cent. of British imports into Persia are distributed. This current of British trade now passes via Bagdad, and if the direct route were opened, in view of the scheme to link up the Bagdad Railway with Hamadan that the Mohammereh line should be constructed, unless we can be sure that the control of the Persian Gulf section of the Bagdad Railway shall be in British hands, and that we can prevent British sea-borne trade via Bagdad being penalised out of the market.

The Mohammereh line would lose much of its importance for our trade if we are on this point, it would nevertheless, I believe, still afford the means of access for British merchandise to the Hamadan. Also, it would not seem desirable to have the map of Persia showing British goods fair play, the north-western end of the line would of course be a great advantage. This prospect is, however, unlikely as such a line would be very disadvantageous to Russian interests, but even so, with the Mohammereh Khoremsabad line we should be better placed to defend our trade against Russian commercial invasion should Russia begin to construct southwards from Tiflis.

If His Majesty's Government decide for any reason to postpone for the present the prosecution of this scheme, Colonel ( ) that we should have recourse to a line from Ahwaz or Mohammereh to Khor Musa via Khor Musa, the line being linked up by a branch to the Mohammereh line.

Hamadan-Kerman line is, of course, not so urgent, as it would be in our zone. Please refer to my despatch No. 272 of the 19th December. I am informed by Mr. Preece that the word "tramway" was only employed to avoid using the word "railway". He hopes that under a new Cabinet his scheme may be adopted.

7629

Government of India to the Earl of Crewe.—(Received at Foreign Office, March 1.)

(Telegraphic) P

February 23, 1911

Telegram dated the 16th instant in connection with trans-Persian railway, a despatch was sent, in which all four lines referred to in your telegram have been discussed. A line from Mohammereh to Khoremsabad would have to compete with trans-Persian railway and with the line from Bagdad to Hamadan, and consequently would, in our opinion, be useless for practical purposes. Now that trans-Persian railway is to be counterpoised to Bagdad Railway, line from Tiflis to Mohammereh, which would have been useful as a counterpoise to that railway, has quite lost its value. In these circumstances consideration for Mohammereh Hamadan line should be obtained merely for earmarking purposes, as against any attempt at a connection by this route of Bagdad Railway extension with the Persian Gulf. At the same time despatch of Wilson to survey Daxil Burnjird section up to Russian sphere would probably be a good move politically. We share view of resident, Persian, of that prior consultation with Persian Government is unnecessary. Wilson asks for services of a local surveyor, which we would give him.

Lines (1) between Mohammereh and Bunder Abbas, via Khor Musa, Khababan, and Shiraz, and (2) between Kerman and Bunder Abbas, have our strong support, but one via Kirgiz from Bushire to join line (1) is deprecated by us. Cost of such a line would be very great, and both as a bar to German enterprise and as a commercial

project it would be quite unnecessary, since all trade would be attracted to Bunder Abbas by Bunder Abbas-Shiraz-Mohammereh line, and importance of Bushire as a port would be entirely destroyed. As regards financial responsibility on account of railway guarantee, we are prepared to discuss proposals for sharing liability with Imperial revenue.

[7646]

No. 139.

Lord Cromer to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 1.)

No. 1, Portland Place, London, February 27

Dear Sir, I am glad to hear that the Russian Government have given their consent to the construction of a railway connecting the Persian Gulf with the Russian territory, but abandoned at the instance of the British Government. Now, they are free to go on with it and are anxious to do so. Perhaps you remember that when I wrote to you last I was sending my representative, Mr. W. to secure me a forest in Manchuria. It turned out to be better than was represented, and we have bought it. On his return journey he made friends with a highly placed

He has recently received a telegram from the Russian Government, treating with responsible people. After consultation with financiers in London and Paris, I find that it will be easy to arrange for the construction of the railway (for which no enormous sum is required) upon terms which will be very favourable to us. If the Foreign Office were no objection, I should like to go to St. Petersburg and will try to obtain those terms. If he cannot obtain them the business will be dropped; if he can, the railway will be made. The Russian official informed him that the Deutsche Bank were trying to get the line, but that the Russians preferred to give it to an English syndicate, if any terms could be arranged. If either German or English are to make this, I should think it would be advisable to exclude German influence from that

But that is a political question upon which I am not of English policy in that part of the East with which you are only concerned. I will be best for English interests.

Yours

J. M. CRIP

Enclosure: L. 10 No. 100

Y. to respecting Jucha-Tabreez Railway

(Received March 1)

Some fifteen years ago the Russian Government wanted to build a railroad of 100 miles from the frontier district until Tiflis. The Russian Government then opposed most decidedly against the plan, and they built a main road until Tabreez, and Russia entered an understanding with Persia, according to which Russia undertook that it would not put rails upon the road before the 31st March, 1910.

anyhow has been built in such a way that 118 versts of the road, the length of which is 140 versts, are built in a way as to carry immediately

This road has been built by a company on shares, the shares of which really are in possession of the Russian Ministry of Finance.

The Excellency P. and states counsel, is the chairman of this company, and of course he also belongs simultaneously to the staff of the Finance Ministry.

His Excellency P. got in the beginning of January (Russian style) from the Minister of Finance the authorisation to treat for the construction of this railroad.

This railroad not being on Russian territory, and being bound after nine years to fall back to the Persian Government, the Russian Government can guarantee nothing on this railroad, and cannot ask money from the Persians for it, and in general, for political reasons, prefer to make it a seemingly private concern.



The application for the collection, according to my knowledge, has been made after my departure from St. Petersburg.

Short information about the Building of a Ho-broad on the Main Road of Tobru

According to the statistical information concerning the cargo movement between Russia and Persia across the Trans-Caucasian frontier on hand the movement to and fro for the year to be constructed and for 1910 is contemplated with about 6,000,000

<sup>1</sup> For cargo traffic, at rates from 1/6¢ per vessel and port, "in late volume"—

Tub

$P$  is independent of the trial.

We propose to issue 4½ per cent. debentures for the ninety five years or at 80 per cent., the same to be made at once for the whole amount. Two years later, two years

Therefore the nominal capital, not including the promotion expenses, shall have to be 11,800,000 roubles.

[illegible]

London, February 23, 1911.

Letter to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 1)

Constantinople, March 1, 1911

The proposals of the Porte are to form a new joint-stock company, with capital furnished by British, French, and German capitalists, and by the Ottoman Government, the latter providing 40 per cent., the others 20 per cent. each.

As the political status of Kowloon, which is mentioned as the most suitable terminus, presents cert. in "particularities," and as the Ottoman Government must have the  $\pi$  under their direct administration, it will be necessary to regularise the

The memorandum also calls attention to the utility of reaching an understanding regarding the respective rights in the Persian Gulf of the two Powers.

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lushington*

Foreign Office, March 2, 1911

FL 4610 410 Railways

It is essential that we should have precise information as to whether the Turkish proposals are communicated in your telegram No. 52 of the 2nd March have been made with the approval and cognisance of the

Please make necessary enquiries of Turkish Government.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 3

*India Office, March 3, 1911*

WITH reference to your letter of the 28th January regarding the status of  
No. 1, I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to forward, for the  
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a copy of the letter of the  
with the Government of India."

I am to say that the Earl of Crewe concurs in the opinions expressed by  
 at Colonel Cox and the Government of India. The necessary conditions  
 lent to any concession on the part of His Majesty's Government with regard to  
 the status of Kowloon appear to him to be -

1. [redacted] for His Majesty's Government of predominant control in the Bagdad lower section of the Bagdad Railway, for which purpose he contributes 56 per cent. of capital and control inadequate.

2. A binding assurance that Kuwait will be the terminus
3. The absolute control, jointly with the sheikh, of the harbour and port, both

1. A satisfactory agreement between the sheikh and the Turkish Government as to the division of customs and transit duties. In return for this, His Majesty's Government might admit, and advise the sheikh to admit, Turkish suzerainty over Kuwait to the full extent compatible with—

(a) The complete autonomy of Kuwait in respect of its internal administration, to be guaranteed by a firman to the sheikh, and confirmed by a written undertaking to His Majesty's Government, as proposed by Colonel Fox.

\* Viscount Morley to Government of India, February 16 (Telegraphic), Government of India to Viscount Morley, February 23 (Telegraphic).

1) The maintenance of our agreements with the shukh.  
2) The recognition by Turkey of Im Kaser, Babayan, and Warin as part of Koweit territory under Turkish suzerainty, and the withdrawal of Turkish guards and symbols of authority therefrom.

A reasonable settlement of all property disputes, the shukh taking papers for his son, should also be included.  
It is to be understood that, if the question of tribute is not in the division of customs duties, &c., in a liberal spirit.

Whether the Turkish Government will be prepared to negotiate on these terms will presumably depend largely upon the value which they attach to considerations mainly of a sentimental order. On the other hand, the concession which His Majesty's Government are prepared to make, in facilitating the use of Koweit as a terminus for the Bagdad Railway, is of a very substantial nature, and in considering what we may reasonably expect to receive in return it must be borne in mind that the position which His Majesty's Government have built up for themselves at Koweit, and fortified by formal agreements with the shukh, is together with the similar position which they held at Mohammerah the one solid asset that they possess in those regions, and that they have been at pains to acquire it precisely for some such purpose as that to which it is now to be put, while, quite apart from all question of competent

to do for them (as Mr. Marking has pointed out in despatch No. 14 of the 4th January last) to abandon such a loan of prestige as would be disastrous to their general policy and interests in the Persian Gulf.

For these reasons Lord Cromer would regard the conditions recapitulated above as essential to a satisfactory settlement. It is clear that in any negotiations that may be opened great care must be taken to avoid making any admissions with regard to the status of Koweit that may be used to our detriment should the whole negotiations prove abortive, or should some place other than Koweit eventually be adopted as the

In conclusion, I am to express the hope that any opportunity that offers may be taken to dispose of the other outstanding questions referred to in my letter of the 9th December, 1910 (annexed).

I am, &c.  
R. B. H. H. H.

8028

No. 134

Sir G. Lathier to Sir Edward Grey -- (Received March 5.)

(No. 56)

(Telegraphic) P.

BAGDAD P. 134

Constantinople, March 4, 1911

I am in reply to your telegram No. 56 of the 3rd instant, I am to inform you that the German Government is generally cognizant of the conditions proposed, and that the German Ambassador has intimated that his Government could not agree to any foreign group having a larger share in the Bagdad-Persian Gulf section than the Germans. The actual document containing the Turkish proposals has, however, not been shown to his Excellency.

8104

No. 135

Sir G. Lathier to Sir Edward Grey -- (Received March 6.)

No. 136

Sir,

Constantinople, February 28, 1911

With reference to my telegram No. 56 of the 12th instant, I have the honour to inform you that the subject of the funds available for kilometre guarantees for the extension of the Bagdad Railway. This useful statement shows clearly that Turkey has an ample margin for the Halil-Bagdad section.

AND LOWFILL

Enclosure in N

Memorandum by Commercial Attaché to British Embassy at Constantinople

IN the accompanying statements an attempt has been made to establish as far as is possible the situation of the surpluses yielded by the revenues which have been specially set aside for the payment of kilometre guarantees, and annual charges on account of various loans, with a view of ascertaining the amount of liquid funds which are at the disposal of Government and which could be applied to the extension of the Bagdad Railway from Halil towards Bagdad. The surpluses for five years viz. 1321 (1905-1906) to 1325 (1909-1910) and the figures having been obtained from official publications and are therefore considered fairly accurate.

Statement "A" shows the surpluses yielded by the other revenues assigned for payment of the kilometre guarantees of the lines of the Anatolian system—Hindar-Podun-Angora and Eskishehr-Konya Railways—after the payment of these guarantees and also indicates the amounts of the charges which have to be met out of the surpluses, viz. the working expenses of the Konya-Eregli section of the Bagdad Railway, and, secondly, the amounts which had to be taken, to make up the insufficiency of the revenues of the lines allotted to the payment of the annuity (£ T 97,120) of the Bagdad Railway-Konya-Eregli-Bagdarin loan (1st series).

The net surpluses, after deduction of the two above-mentioned charges, of the lines belonging to the Anatolian system, are shown in statement "B," along with the revenue set apart for the payment of the annuity of the Bagdad Railway other than Anatolian and Bagdad, as well as the amount free of these guarantee and annuity charges—

	£ T
Surplus of 1321	128,570
Surplus of 1322	227,104
Leaving an average liquid surplus of	40,368

Returns for the year 1326, which will end on the 28th (13th) March, 1911, forecasted, however, a substantial margin.

	£ T
Surplus of 1326	128,570
Less working expenses Konya-Eregli	26,120
Expected surplus	292,014
Less and more revenues earmarked for other railway guarantees and annuities expected to require a surplus of	860,000
From which permanent charges must be deducted	—
Leaving a probable surplus for 1326 of	132,014

1. The kilometre guarantees for the Bagdad Railway extension from the present terminus to Halil, requiring the payment of an annuity of £ T 420,000 for the Bagdad loans, and £ T 200,000 for series 2, and £ T 220,000 for series 3.

According to the stipulations of the said loans, the Government share (75 per cent.) in the surpluses derived from the ceded revenues administered by the Public Debt has been assigned to the payment of this annuity, after a permanent charge of £ T 124,050 '80 due for the service of the 1904 loan of 4 per cent., has been met. It is clearly understood, however, that these surpluses will not be available for meeting the annuity for series 2 and 3 until the complete extinction of the three short loans contracted with the Imperial Ottoman Bank (two in 1906 and one in 1907), the advances obtained from the Deutsche Bank in January and March 1908, and a short loan from the Anatolian Railway



Company in March 1908, all of which are a charge on the surpluses of the ceded revenues (Government share).

Provision has also been made, in the case of these surpluses falling short at any time of the required amount of £ T. 420,000, and it is stipulated that any insufficiency in one year is to be made good from the first proceeds of the sheep tax of the following year collected in the provinces of Konya, Adana, and Aleppo, with the proviso that the tax collected in the Aleppo district can only be utilised after the payment of £ T. 100,000 annually for Russian war indemnity.

The gross surpluses of the ceded revenues and the Government share (75 per cent.) are shown in detail for five years in statement "C." It will be seen that there has been a fair increase, that the amount of the Government share in 1911 was £ T. 529,448, but that the average for the five years is £ T. 420,000. For 1326 (1910-1911) is expected to be not less than £ T. 600,000. To the annual surplus after 1326 (1910-1911) will be added the Government share of the interest on the reserve fund of £ T. 2,000,000 of the Public Debt, which will amount to about £ T. 100,000.

Already stated, certain charges have to be paid out of these surpluses, and those which are to be met by the surplus for the year 1326 (1910-1911) are the following:

Expected of the Government share	£ T.
Charges	
Annuity for the 4 per cent. loan of 1904	
Lessing a probable balance of ..	
Expected surplus for 1326 ..	

The permanent charges to be paid out of ceded revenue surpluses after the year 1326 (1910-1911) are:

Annuity for the 4 per cent. loan of 1904	£ T.
Annuity for the Bagdad Railway Series 2 and 3 ..	
Total .. .. .	514,000

The full amount of £ T. 420,000 will, however, not be required until the railway is completed.

Admitting that the probable amounts to be realised from the year 1327 will be equal to the expected surplus of 1326, viz., £ T. 600,000, the Government then have a balance in hand, after deduction of the permanent charges,

Of which	£ T.
Plus the share of interest on reserve fund .. .. .	80,000
Total .. .. .	114,500

#### f. To sum up the situation—

On the basis of the five years' average of general surpluses, viz., from titles and other revenues assigned to Anatolian and other railways (except Bagdad) and service of loans, as well as those from ceded revenues set aside for the Bagdad Railway, series 2 and 3, the figures will be as follows:—

Surplus from titles (including A)	£ T.
plus from ceded revenues (Government share, Part interest on reserve fund of Public Debt)	
Less permanent charges	
Surpluses at the disposal of Government .. .. .	334,448

(b.) The situation worked out on the basis of the returns for 1325 and those expected for 1326 would be:—

		(expected)
Surplus from titles and other revenues ..	834,769	£ T. 1,250,000
Surplus from ceded revenues ..	529,448	600,000
Share of interest on reserve fund .. .. .		
Charges to be deducted		
Surplus at disposal .. .. .		

(c.) Should the calculations, however, be strictly confined to the surpluses of revenues earmarked for the Anatolian and Bagdad Railways, the figures, based on the returns for 1325 (1909-1910) and 1326 (1910-1911) (probable), would be respectively as follows:—

		£ T.
Surplus of titles .. .. .	191,762	263,000
Surplus from ceded revenues .. .. .	529,448	600,000
Share of interest on reserve fund .. .. .		
Permanent charges		
Annuity for .. .. .		
Annuity for Series 2 and 3 .. .. .		
At disposal of Government .. .. .	215,421	

The amount which may be due on account of working expenses of the English-Halif section, say 3,000 fr. per kilom., viz., £ T. 110,000 for the 840 kilom., has not been taken into account in the above calculations, and this sum will consequently have to be met from each of the balances.

Estimating that the length of line to be constructed from Halif onwards to Bagdad to be about 600 kilom.,

The sum required to meet the annuity for this section would be .. .. .

The estimated surpluses derived from titles and revenues set aside for the service of loans for the year 1325, and those expected for 1326, may serve as a basis for estimating the probable surpluses of the future, and it is therefore evident the Government will have an ample margin in hand for providing the annuity necessary for the Halif-Bagdad section without engaging any further revenues.

Should the Government, however, decide that the annuity of £ T. 300,000 and the working expenses of £ T. 80,000 be only paid out of surpluses of revenues specially set aside for the service of the Anatolian and Bagdad Railways, the sums at the disposal of

(c) in the previous paragraph, be inadequate, and it is in that case quite conceivable that the Bagdad Railway administration might insist on the guarantee already given of the Bagdad section, in order that any insufficiencies of title and ceded revenue surpluses for payment of the annuity might be fully covered. The total proceeds of the sheep tax of the three districts is close upon £ T. 300,000, from which £ T. 40,000 has to be deducted for Russian war indemnity account.

## Statement "A"

STATEMENT showing details of Surpluses for five years, viz., 1909-10 to 1913-14 (1909-10), yielded by the Tithes set aside for the Payment of Kilometric Guarantees of the Hasdar Pasha-Angora and Eskishehr-Konia Lines of the Anatolian Railway

Year	1	2	3	4	5
	Gross Surplus after payment of Kilometric	Working Expenses of Bagdad Railway-Konia-Eskishehr Section, paid from	Less: Tithes set aside for the Payment of Kilometric Guarantees	Total Surplus after	Net Surplus
1909-10	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000
1910-11	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000
1911-12	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000
1912-13	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000
1913-14	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000

The tithes set aside in 1909-10 were of £ T 1,100,000.  
The guarantees paid in 1909 were—  
Hasdar Pasha-Konia .. £ T 1,100,000

Working expenses of the Bagdad Railway, Konia-Eskishehr Section, paid out of this surplus .. £ T 1,100,000

## Statement "B"

STATEMENT of Surpluses yielded by Tithes (including Anatolia) and other Revenues set aside for the Payment of Kilometric Guarantees and Service of Loans.

Net Surplus of Tithes	Net Surplus of Tithes and other Revenues assigned to other Railways and service of loans	Total of Net Surpluses of Columns 1 and 2
£ T 1,100,000	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 2,200,000
1909-10	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 2,200,000
1910-11	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 2,200,000
1911-12	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 2,200,000
1912-13	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 2,200,000
1913-14	£ T 1,100,000	£ T 2,200,000
Total	£ T 5,500,000	£ T 11,000,000

Average for five years, £ T 696,388. Expected surplus for 1914 £ T 1,150,000.

Permanent charges on these surpluses are the following—	£ T
Current account with the Imperial Ottoman Bank (Mandatory)	100,000
Taken by the Ottoman Public Debt as lieu of the Roumelian Tribute	114,000
Part of the annuity of the 1908 loan of 4 per cent	40,000
Annual expenditure for irrigation works in Konia plain	25,000
Military transport	10,000
Total	299,000

## Statement "C"

SURPLUSES from old "Ceded" Revenues belonging to the Public Debt for the Years 1905-1910 (1905-1906 to 1909-1910).

	Government share of per cent.
1905-1906	415,600
1906-1907	415,600
1907-1908	415,600
1908-1909	415,600
1909-1910	415,600
Average for the five years	415,600
Expected surplus for 1910-1911	415,600

It is proposed on the reserve fund of the Public Debt of £ T 1,000,000 provided according to article 8 of the annex to the Decree of Moharrem, will, after the year 1910, be added to the general revenues of the Public Debt, and will thus increase the surplus by about £ T 78,000 per annum. Of this sum the Government will receive 75 per cent, or £ T 58,500.

February 19, 1911

8109)

No. 136

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 6.)

(No. 136) Confidential

Sir,

Pera, March 1, 1911

RIFAAT PASHA handed to me today the enclosed memorandum, which he had written in connection with the proposed settlement of the Anatolian Railway.

I told his Excellency that I abstained from making any comment on the proposals, and that I would forward the memorandum to you by the messenger who is leaving today.

Since the issue of the negotiations with the Ottoman Government at the present time, I have not had any opportunity to discuss the proposed settlement. Referring to the advantages anticipated would constitute a sufficient advantage.

I have, &c.

GARD LOWTHER

Closure in No. 136

Memorandum communicated to Sir G. Lowther by Rifaat Pasha.

L'INTÉRÊT qui s'attache à l'achèvement du Chemin de Fer de Bagdad-Golfe Persique, la nécessité latente d'assurer l'application de la majoration douanière de 4 pour cent amènent le Gouvernement Impérial à envisager, pratiquement, l'examen de ces deux affaires avec le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique, en tant que lesdites affaires intéressent, sous certains de leurs aspects, le Gouvernement Royal.



Le Gouvernement du Roi a posé une condition à son assentiment à la majoration projetée, savoir, que le supplément de recettes qu'elle produirait, ne fût pas affecté aux dépenses kilométriques du Chemin de Fer de Bagdad. Si donc le Gouvernement Impérial ottoman amenait la compagnie dudit chemin de fer à ne pas élever de prétentions sur ce point, on

D'autre part, à raison des inconvénients qui empêchent la Compagnie du Chemin de Fer de Bagdad de construire et d'exploiter dans les mêmes conditions que le reste de son réseau, le tronçon Bagdad-Golfe Persique, qui est compris dans sa concession et dont la construction est, d'ailleurs, absolument nécessaire pour assurer à cette voie ferrée son débouché naturel, il s'agirait d'obtenir que la compagnie renonçât au droit qui lui fut concédé de construire et d'exploiter également le tronçon Bagdad-Golfe Persique. Tel est l'autre aspect de la question.

Or, le Gouvernement ottoman a déjà engagé, au sujet de ces deux points, des pourparlers avec la Compagnie de Bagdad; et

ent aux recettes appelées à se  
cent, mais aussi à toutes autres

recettes qui y

Dette publique ottomane. La Sublime Porte est d'autant plus fondée à compter sur la renonciation, que des calculs de statistique établissent la progression des revenus dont la Compagnie de Bagdad dispose actuellement et que, partant, lui assurant, dans un avenir prochain, des ressources suffisantes pour l'achèvement de la voie jusqu'à Bagdad, sans qu'il faille lui affecter de recettes

Le G

Il après

utile et expédient de recourir, pour ledit

ottomane dont le capital serait fourni tant par le Gouver

à lui-même que par des groupes de capitalistes anglais, français et

Ce capital est à répartir de la façon suivante: 40 pour cent pour le Gouvernement Impérial, 20 pour cent à chacun des groupes de capitalistes étrangers.

Les frais de construction pourront, d'après le système actuel de la ligne Konie-Bagdad, être couverts par une

Gouvernement Impérial et dirigés à Londres. Les frais de construction, ainsi que le capital actions de la société nouvelle et toute autre modalité de formation de la société et de l'émission, seront naturellement réglées après entente entre le Gouvernement Impérial et les groupes intéressés.

Le point terminus de la voie ferrée, sur le Golfe Persique, on ne saurait le choisir que Koweit d'abord, Bassora ensuite. Le Gouvernement pense que Koweit est, par sa situation, tout indiqué pour servir de débouché au chemin de fer. Comme cependant la situation politique de Koweit présente certaines particularités, et que d'autre part, il importe logiquement, que le point terminus du chemin de fer de Bagdad soit sous l'administration directe du Gouvernement ottoman, il a été décidé de régulariser, en premier lieu, les rapports de Koweit vis-à-vis de l'Empire, ce qui pourra rendre possible l'exploitation du port à créer dans cette localité par la société anonyme nouvelle.

Sur la même occasion, apparaît l'utilité essentielle d'une entente entre le Gouvernement ottoman et le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique, à l'effet de régler les questions du Golfe Persique, respectivement par rapport aux droits politiques et aux des deux pays, en établissant, sans équivoque, la position de

etc. que les intérêts de la Grande Bretagne s'opposent à la pénétration de l'influence étrangère dans le Golfe Persique, il est non moins certain que, sur ce point, les intérêts essentiels du Gouvernement ottoman se rencontrent avec ceux du Royaume-Uni, l'Empire ottoman n'étant, lui-même, nullement disposé à encourager

De sorte qu'une parité d'intérêts entre le Gouvernement ottoman et le Gouvernement britannique, jointe à leur égal désir d'arriver à une entente sur tous les points qui ont pu jusqu'ici livrer leurs vœux, mettra les deux gouvernements à même de conclure, dans un esprit d'amitié et de conciliation, le règlement définitif des questions en cause.

Sir F. Corbett to Sir Edward Grey.—Received March 6.)

(No. 17.)

Sir,

Munich, March 2, 1911

THE question of the Bagdad Railway continues in no slight degree to occupy public attention here. Statements made on the subject in Parliament and in the press that appear in the British press are closely followed by the German press. I lose no opportunity of insisting that the question is one of the interests of England and Germany and only very indirectly Great Britain.

The "Frankfurter Zeitung" of to-day's date treats the matter at some length and with more than the usual frankness. After contrasting the attitude of the British and German press very

on to observe that, in the subject which is so desirable. "England's position in the East," says the writer, "her supremacy in the waters of the Persian Gulf, and her alleged protectorate over the Turkish town of Koweit are made the ground for claims which have direct reference to indisputably Turkish territory, and—most important point of all—the English Government is to be forced to claim for England the control over the so-called last section of the railway, that is to say, over a distance of some 600 miles from Bagdad southwards to the Persian Gulf. The granting of this claim is to be the *quid pro quo* for reasonable and friendly relations with Turkey and Germany. Some particularly zealous journalists even talk about an insurance in this sense or a danger to the world."

The question of the railway might be treated with far better hope of a satisfactory solution for England if our neighbours on the other side of the channel got rid of a habit which is clearly deeply ingrained.

Claims and rights. It seems to be an indisputable fact that England does claim an exclusive protectorate over Koweit, and similarly the so-called control over the final section of the railway. Thus, however, is not the question—the point simply is, what rights England has over the terminal and final section of the line here. The writer at all for such a right and no one can take

England from asserting her dominion in India, but to make the securing of the line in India an excuse for establishing English rights over ports and railways in Mesopotamia is as absurd as it would be to claim a suzerainty over Southern Italy. Koweit is just about as far from

as from Naples. In the Turkey are notoriously of a different opinion from the English, and we have no reason to believe that their conception is the less well grounded of the two. But whether the solution of the question ultimately gives England a partial or a complete protectorate over Koweit, her claims concerning the southern section of the line are not in the least advanced thereby. To argue from a protectorate over Koweit to a control of the railways in South Mesopotamia is like claiming control over the whole Spanish railway

the strength of the possession of Gibraltar. It is certain, however, that in England on this point is now following a more reasonable line, and this is

The "States" has recently shown with the clearest clarity that Turkey is mistress on her own territory, with power to build such railways as she chooses to treat with those companies which she has chosen for this purpose. The Turkish newspapers could calm themselves more easily with the

officially expressed her wish to come to an amicable understanding with the Government on the question of Koweit and the other subjects

Bagdad Railway at present are

and the Bagdad Railway Company, which is under German management. In this reference we have already repeatedly pointed out—lastly on the 16th February—that any negotiations of either party with a third must proceed on the basis of a mutual agreement to take this action. Without this the Turkish and English Governments and the German and English financiers are neither able nor willing to begin negotiations. Those impatient individuals who see the Germans already at the doors of Koweit and desire to drive the Foreign Office to take vigorous measures in order to prevent so terrible an eventuality would do well to satisfy themselves that Turkey and the interested parties in Germany have the next say in the matter. That it is so these

same inspirers of public opinion in England have themselves to thank, seem to be the men who at the crucial moment succeeded in preventing England's competition in the undertaking. We have sufficient trust in the sound business sense of the Englishmen to believe that it will eventually win the victory over the extravagant political chauvinism which has hitherto impaired British action in this matter. With Englishmen it is possible to discuss business, though not politics. If Englishmen would only treat the Bagdad Railway problem from the point of view of their own practical interests they would doubtless find that the Turks and Germans would meet them in a reasonable spirit.

I have, &c.  
VINCENT CORBET

8296

No. 138

Sir E. Grey to Sir Edward Grey — (Received March 6)

(Telegraphic) P  
RAILWAYS. Reference to my telegrams Nos. 68 and 71 dated the 1st and 3rd March respectively.  
I venture to submit that before His Majesty's Government breach the subject of railways in Southern Persia to Persian Government, it might be worth our while to ask some British house that they should apply for the concession which is most likely to be granted to us.  
Vakil ul Royn, when the bank manager has sounded several times on the subject of a railway concession, appeared to favour the idea.  
Imperial Bank of Persia might possibly be induced to apply for the concession we desire, and transfer it to third parties if obtained.  
Bank manager's suggestion that he should try to obtain a concession has already been approved by head office, but the only proposal that has been invited was a railway right up to Tehran via Hamadan from the Karun valley. In the light of communications from St. Petersburg which have made it clear that Russian financial co-operation for the line Khaukin Teuran via Hamadan, and might be worthy of consideration.

8442

No. 1

The Earl of Crewe to Government of India. — (Received at the Foreign Office, March 7)

(Telegraphic) P  
RAILWAYS in Persia. See your telegram dated the 23rd February.  
Your letter is awaited. Meanwhile, however, I should be glad to know whether you have considered situation that will arise in the event of Bagdad Railway being extended to Khaukin and Trans-Persian line not being built. Line from Mohammerah to Khorezmabad is proposed, as only means of saving and extending our trade in Western Persia, precisely in order to compete with extension of Bagdad Railway.  
The following is secret —

Opinion is expressed by Foreign Office that probability of our obtaining a controlling interest in the Gulf section of the Bagdad line is very small, but participation on our part might nevertheless be worth while.

8441

No. 140

The Earl of Crewe to Government of India. — (Received at the Foreign Office March 7)

(Telegraphic) P  
BAGDAD Railway. See my telegram dated the 10th February, 1911.  
Turkish Government's proposals are summarised below. Any observations you may wish to offer will doubtless be communicated by telegraph —

Formation of a new joint stock company is proposed by the Porte, the capital of which would be provided in the following proportions —

"Forty per cent. by Ottoman Government, 20 per cent. each by German, British

17

French capitalists. State bonds to be issued in Berlin, London, Constantinople, and Paris, to provide for the cost of construction. As terminus must be under the direct administration of the Ottoman Government, and as the political status of Kow, which is mentioned as the most suitable terminus, presents certain particularities, it is necessary to regularise Kow's relations to the Turkish Empire. Utility of arriving at an understanding as to the two Powers' respective rights in the Persian Gulf is also brought to notice.

8468

No. 141

Sir E. Grey to Sir

(Telegraphic) P  
GERMANY and Russia.  
In conversation with our today Count d'Achenthal said he gathered, from the fact that he had received on this subject, that Russia and Germany had arrived at an agreement as regards the main points of their negotiations, and that the final agreement was now about to be drafted, but there were still the details to discuss. It was owing to the technical difficulties of the different questions at issue that the negotiations had been somewhat delayed.

8628

No. 142

Government of India to the Earl of Crewe — (Received at Foreign Office, March 7)

(Telegraphic) P  
PLEASE refer to your telegram, dated the 3rd March, as to effect of extension to Khaukin of Bagdad Railway.  
We consider that line from Mohammerah to Khorezmabad becomes of primary importance in the event of proposed trans-Persian line falling through. Our view as to the utility of former line was expressed on the understanding that trans-Persian line would be constructed.

8629

No. 143

Government of India to the Earl of Crewe — (Received at Foreign Office, March 8)

(Telegraphic) P  
RAILWAY from Bagdad to Persian Gulf. Please refer to your telegram dated the 3rd instant.  
It is hardly possible to take seriously the Turkish Government's proposals, which would have the absurd result of placing England in the same position as that of the Ottoman Empire. We should not make of a 20 per cent. participation in section to Gulf, we should desert Sheikh and surrender absolutely our position at Kowest. Turks would at once begin to encroach on rights of tribal chiefs and Sheikh of Mohammerah, whose confidence we should lose by pursuing such a policy.  
We should inform Turkish Government that it is our intention that our position in the Gulf shall be maintained, and that there can be no question of ceding an increase of 4 per cent., and that the additional 3 per cent. will be withdrawn in 1914 unless satisfactory conditions are made for our participation in the line to the Gulf.

7646

No. 144

Sir Edward Grey to Lord Grimthorpe

My dear Grimthorpe,  
I HAVE now had time to consider your letter of the 26th February, in which you ask my official opinion from the point of view of British interests in regard to a scheme for the construction of a railway from Juffa to Tabreez.



I have no objection to your entering into communication, as you propose, with the Russian Government with regard to the scheme, but I can give no definite opinion about it till I know the details and the views of the Russian Government as conveyed

Yours very truly,  
E. GREY

7648

No. 147

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

No. 11. Constantinople

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 8, 1911

I TRANSMIT to your Excellency herewith copies of correspondence with Lord Curzon relative to a scheme for the construction of a railway from Julfa to Tabreez,\* and I have to request you to report to me any information which you are able to obtain respecting the same.

8659

No. 147

U

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you herewith translations of two articles dealing the present phase of the Bagdad Railway question, which appeared in the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of the 5th instant.

The first article is obviously inspired, and the second is reproduced from the *Frankfurter Zeitung* by the semi-official organ, and I then reflect the views of the Imperial Foreign Office.

I have &c.  
W. E. GOSCHEN

Enclosure in No. 116

Extract from the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*

(Translation.)

FOREIGN papers continue to discuss negotiations which are going on between Turkey and England about the Bagdad Railway.

At the legal basis on which the Bagdad Railway, well known, the Bagdad question, as far as the construction of the line to Basra is concerned, has been finally settled between Turkey and the Bagdad Railway Co. the above-mentioned discussions can only refer to the section from Basra to the Persian Gulf. This section too will in common with the whole railway, run exclusively over Turkish territory. It is also included in the concession granted to the company which imposes obligations on the latter vis-à-vis Turkey as well as on Turkey.

possibility either for Turkey or for the German company to deal with third parties respecting the construction of the railway. In any case, especially England, has any wishes respecting the railway, it is then bound to formulate them and to communicate them to the two parties concerned.

These wishes would then be sure of being examined in a friendly manner. In another part of this paper we publish a long article of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* dealing with the same subject.

\* Nos. 130 and 141

8109

No. 147

h

P.

Foreign Office, March 3, 1911

I carefully consider the proposals of the Ottoman Government (see your letter of 1st March), and in due course send in our reply. But your address an official note to His Highness the Sultan pointing out that the Bagdad Railway is in direct conflict with my telegram No. 61 of April 22 of the same year, and I give my attitude respecting the conditions of our assent.

It is quite clear in writing that His Majesty's red increase of customs for a fixed period of years in Mesopotamia were settled in such a way that British interests are not by the disturbance of the *status quo* in these regions, and if the borrowing powers of Egypt were retained.

8628

Foreign Office, March 3, 1911

It is probable that the Ottoman Government will probably have to approach Persian Government for permission for the construction of the line, opinion being agreed that it is of vital importance for the protection of British trade in western Persia. I am aware of the Government's reluctance, as we are anxious to proceed in the matter with the

8929

No. 147

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey - (Received March 10.)

St. Petersburg, March 10, 1911

M. Sazonov, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Your telegram No. 84

that when M. Sazonov is with me I have received from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the following statement: It is however that he may not be well enough for a considerable time and that at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs there is no one at present who can undertake matters to any extent.

He went out that the branch line which is to be constructed from Basra to the Persian Gulf will give German goods easy access to the Persian Gulf. It will be worked by the line now contemplated, and that, in order to secure interests in these regions, we require the line. The extension from the Bagdad line into Northern Persia will render competition inevitable, and the Russian Government ought to realize that, even if M. Sazonov's Khorezmabad line may be somewhat prejudicial to Russian interests, it is essential for us to place ourselves on equal terms with German interests.

It is possible to interest Russia in the undertaking by inviting her to build the northern section running south from Julfa, and by offering her financial assistance to do this, and so rendering it easier for her, but in that case a difficulty would probably arise on the question of rates. (Please see the *note-memoire* of August 13 1908 communicated by the Russian Government.)

It might also be pointed out to the Russian Government that their consent to the construction of the line from M. Sazonov's Khorezmabad would be raised by the Government of India to the railway across Persia.

*Sir G. Louches to Sir Edward Grey.*—(Received March 10.)

Constantinople, March 10, 1914.

ment of yesterday (Nov. 61) respecting the communication  
on this subject, I would suggest that the purpose of His Ma-  
jesty's Government would be just as well served if this communication were made in the  
form taken by the communication with which the Porte  
opened negotiations. I am afraid that an official signed note to Russia has  
no disadvantage but subsequent negotiations might be prejudicially af-  
fected because it is too clear that the official point of view of the Ottoman Government  
regarding this is an Ottoman railway within the territory of the Ottoman Empire.

1

Excerpt from "Parliamentary Debates" of March 8  
March 11, 1901

*We Belfast.* I do not think that the H. we have had full opportunity in the year or so of obtaining any general statement on foreign policy in State for Foreign Affairs. I do not suppose it would be prejudicial, or even desirable, to ask the right honourable gentleman Sir Edward Grey to survey the whole of that great and varied field, when we are in the habit

to be the Year on Account, only when the most important hours of the year have already been expended on a very different subject. But there are in upon which I should like to say a few words and ask a few questions, and which respect connected. Such criticisms as I shall offer upon the based upon what I consider to be the manner in which they are and relation which exists between policy, diplomacy, and Imperial

Some of these subjects reside in the Bagdad Railway. Two or three of my homelands friends have a far intimate acquaintance with the country knowing its resources as well as by study, and can give the names of the

my power. But there are broad areas of policy upon which I can, perhaps, institute the veto. The Baghdad Railway had been a sort of preoccupation of Governments and I see the right honorable gentleman held his tongue about it.

For the right honorable gentleman held his present place, and when we were in office, and I do not suppose that the right honorable gentleman has had an easier time than we had. But I confess that at the present moment we cannot help looking forward with considerable interest to the events which are occurring in connection with Egyptian enterprise in Asia Minor and in Mesopotamia.

to see if some arrangement could not be arrived at by which equal rights could be given to the great commercial nations of the world for an equal share of the mercies made by them. If that had been practicable I think it would have been a good solution. It was not practicable. And if that was it, we must

been a good solution. It was not practicable. We are comparing at this stage. At a time which seems to be not, as far back to the year 1904 (perhaps).

Germany and Turkey were, I understand, preparing to carry out, as they liked, stages of that railway construction which are now in process of development. It is, are coming in sight—are we not—of further developments which do touch very nearly the immediate interests of this country; the commercial, political, and strategic interests in the way those interests not touched while the railway is in.

through Ann Minor, or preventing the defile of the Caucasus. I want to know what course they intend to take, especially with regard to the two possibilities—the two contemplated developments of the railway branch line which is to join Bagdad and Khamkin, and the continuation of the line from Bagdad southward? The first of these is more commercial than strategical. It has more to do with the interests of traders in this country, perhaps, than the immediate balance of power either in the region which it traverses or in other connected regions. From that point of view surely its importance is as great and the menace to our trade as serious that those interested in the trade cannot afford to ignore it. We used to

overwhelming proportion of the trade which goes from the coast to the frontier of Persia. That trade, I believe, is ten times as great as that of any other nation, if it is not ten times as great as all the other nations put together. What safeguard is that trade going to have when that branch or junction is made between Bagdad on the west and the frontier of Persia on the east? I am, Sir, a right honourable gentleman, in the early days of his office, was

The late Lord Percy criticised that agreement from the point of view of its effect on British commerce. He expressed his opinion that, in the partition of zones of interest in Persia, it would be found that the results were very injurious to the development of British commerce, would be minimal even to the commerce that we already possessed—let alone its development!

I think that Lord Percy's prophecies have proved only too true. I say nothing against the right honourable gentleman as to the general aspect of that agreement welcome now, as I have always welcomed, anything which can bring us into closer and friendly relations with the Russian Empire. But the particular point of the

at which has to be borne in mind by the committee at the present time is this: while the Germans appear to have got concessions to construct that line from Bagdad to the Persian frontier, the Russians have got the concession of the line with a view to the Persian frontier. I do not think the Russians have got the concession of the line with a view to the Persian frontier.

lies with them to make that line, because they have within their sphere of influence great railway terminus which must be in the hands of the Power which makes the railway, at all events, it gives a great advantage to the Power that protects the

The result of these forces taken together is that along the route where we have ten times the commerce of the other nations of the world, and in substitution for the existing route for which we are responsible, and which our enterprise has largely

probably does—cause considerable anxiety to the mind of  
honourable gentleman, and I want to know, if I am right in my diagnosis  
disease and the forecast of the danger, what remedy he and his colleagues  
propose for that state of things? I understand that, in answer to a question put by  
my honourable friend the Member for Staffordshire yesterday, the right honourable  
gentleman practically assured him that equality of treatment to British and other  
goods was secured by an article in the convention which he read to the House  
which, I may add, I think he read to the House in a somewhat truncated shape  
introducing some very relevant qualifications which occurred in the article.

I think it would have been well if he had dealt with. But I leave it to  
to develop that point. The point I want to develop is a different

I do not believe that these equalities of rating are necessarily of more value than most-favoured-nation clause. Both of them have the same weakness, namely, that you can grade goods and divide commodities up in such a way that rates which appear equal and are equal on the face of them nevertheless prove with quite as equal severity upon the manufacturing interests of one of two countries. Alternative clause on goods provide that one shall go at one rate and another at another. Then you may announce to the world that anybody who produces goods of quality (A) goes at such a rate, and anybody who produces goods of quality (B)—no matter what his rate, and that therefore everyone is on the same level.

ness article (B) may find that the trade ratios, formally equal, press with quite an unequal severity upon one or other of the manufacturing countries. That, I believe, has actually happened in railway rates under the control of nations who do not share the

actually happened in railway rates under the control of nations who do not share the  
of the Government that politics and commerce should be kept in water-tight  
departments, and not allowed to mix the one with the other? There are nations who  
take a different view of what can be done by an active policy; in consequence  
their manufacturers, in certain cases, are better served than their commercial or  
rivaling rivals. That is the

unfriendly gentleman. With regard to the commercial aspect of the project, especially that part of it which is to join the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean, the continuation of the railway to the Persian Gulf is also a commercial subject. We cannot

in this House mention the commercial development without remembering that, quite apart from Britain's preponderance of commercial interests in that part of the world, we have strategic interests, and interests which cannot be forgotten or ignored, connected with our prestige in India and Afghanistan, and all those adjacent countries. I am sure the right honourable gentleman does not wish to forget or ignore them. Equally



undoubtedly they are threatened—if we may judge the ordinary signs of the times—certain projects of railway construction to a large extent far into the Turkish Empire. I am sure the Government are prepared to give us every assurance with regard to Kuwait and as to the policy of the Government. The right honourable gentleman has made declarations in this House in previous years which, so far as I am concerned, seemed to me at the time to be perfectly satisfactory, and from which I do not believe he will recede. Nevertheless, I think he will regard our anxiety on this side of the House as not without its justification. He will feel that our interests, not merely our commercial interests, but our political, imperial, diplomatic, and national interests are being threatened by some schemers, and require the special and arduous care of the Foreign Office if they are to remain wholly unimpaired. These are the two questions I wish to ask. How do the Government propose to deal with the railway towards Persia from Bagdad, towards Persia on the one side and towards the Gulf on the other?

*The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey).—*The right honourable gentleman has asked me a general statement of policy. That is to say as I understood him to mean, that at this late subject of foreign policy by itself was so large that I could not be expected to do it. He also intimated that there were other hon. members of the House who desired to speak. I shall compress my remarks as shortly as I can in order that there may be as much time as possible for others who follow me. I thought it a little remarkable after the right honourable gentleman began by saying that the hour was somewhat late that

he would confine himself, as far as possible, to answering him on the particular points which he raised. He dealt first of all with the Bagdad Railway. I have no complaint to make whatever of his introducing that subject into the debate. I have no complaint to make of the tone or substance of the remarks which he made about it, but I would observe generally with regard to what he said of the Bagdad Railway, that it is always possible and even to fix on certain parts of the world which are not under our control, which are not likely to be under our control, and in which events may not be altogether moving according to our minds. That is always the case in some parts of the world, and that always offers a field for comment. I have no complaint to make of the right honourable gentleman's comment with regard to the importance of our trade interests in that part of the world, but where, I think, his speech stopped short was at the point where he might have shown what lever we had, what position we occupy, what powers we have by which we should be enabled to control the course of events in that part of the world. He has admitted himself that the Bagdad Railway question was one with which he had been familiar when he was in office. He said that an opportunity arose at that time of taking part in the Bagdad Railway or coming to some terms about it, an opportunity which he regretted to say had not resulted in its being found practicable to secure equal terms with regard to that railway. That happened while he was in office. When that opportunity had passed, surely it was not easy for us to create the opportunity again or to take advantage of it. I should like the right honourable gentleman to be quite clear at this. I am not reflecting upon anything that he did while he was in office. I do not say it was an opportunity of which more could be made than his Government made of it. I only want to emphasize this fact, the Bagdad Railway concession has come to existence, I think while they were in office, they did not find it practicable to prevent it. They were quite as conscious of British interests as they are now. As to British participation in the enterprise. So it was not likely, when the Bagdad Railway had made some further progress, that we should find it easier than they did, and in the comment of the right honourable gentleman there was nothing to show that we were in a more favourable position than his own Government was for arranging terms with regard to British interests in the Bagdad Railway. On the contrary, since, it is that the undertaking being more solidly established when it came to office, it was less likely that we should be able to get us favourable terms than we might have been able to obtain in earlier days.

It is time to oppose the Bagdad Railway, if it was to be opposed in British interests, was before the concession was granted. The concession once granted was a German

concession remains to lay as we found it when it was not been extended, and it is with in the present to carry out the concession in the Turkish territory. Now, the right honourable gentleman says that a branch going to be in the Bagdad to Kharabeh, and that will affect an important artery of British trade. The concession for that branch was contained in the original concession of the Bagdad Railway, and that remains at law where it is. Beyond Turkish territory there is going to be a branch made from Kharabeh to Tehran, and that is not going to be under British control. Well, whether there has been the concession or not, anyone who looks at the map and sees that the branch from Kharabeh to Tehran is going to proceed not south but north into Persian territory will know that under no conditions in recent years would it have been possible for us to

have that must always be so. The north of Persia is out of our reach. The concession for the branch there we could not have protected it. We could not have protected it if we had secured it. The concession was made, it has been made, and we are to protect British commercial interests, they must be protected in the north of Persia. That remains unaffected by anything we can do. The right honourable gentleman says it is important British trade should be protected. As far as it can be protected by guaranteeing equal rights for trade on the railway it will be protected but more than that we cannot do with regard to the railway. The right honourable gentleman said that those guarantees might be worked as to be in practice unfavourable to British trade. I am sure that is to make other routes of your own for British trade which the Germans have got from the railway. We must stop them making the railway

the railway in the north of Persia itself. If the guarantees you can get, and which I think we have got, and which, indeed, we are entitled to demand, that there should be no other routes of your own for British trade.

He said that we could not do so far as to suggest that. He commented upon the weakness of our position. He suggested no lever that we could use and use it to our advantage.

the new regime in Turkey strengthened. I wish to see them

now is to be used to make railways which will take the place of means of communication.

and we are satisfied that British trade interests will be satisfactorily guarded. I would like the House to be quite clear on this point. The Bagdad Railway is a concession in Turkish territory, and as such we have no right or title to object to it.

source of revenue to the Turkish Government, then we do come to the point where we have a right to demand that before we agree to those increased concessions the Government should make it clear that the revenue is going to be used for the benefit of the Turkish people.

to the purposes to which we wish to see it applied, namely, the strengthening of the Turkish Empire, and for other reasons the Turkish Government may be anxious to see the interests of British

gentleman asked a further question as to Kowloon. That is quite a different question to the mere question of a concession in Turkish territory, but, if the Bagdad Railway is to be built in Turkish territory, then of course our diplomatic position in the Persian Gulf becomes very different from what it is as long as it remains purely Turkish territory. We are not anxious to disturb the *status quo* in the Persian Gulf to a great extent that *status quo* has been built up by us in previous generations. We have practically opened the Persian Gulf to trade and kept it open. That has been our policy. We are not anxious to have a forward policy in the Persian Gulf, but if the *status quo* is disturbed by others then we must undoubtedly use our resources to maintain the position we have in the Persian Gulf. Part of the *status quo* has been entered into treaty obligations with the Sheikh of Kuwait, and in any case which there may be or in any changes which may take place it is an obligation to our treaty obligations towards the Sheikh of Kuwait in maintaining the *status quo*. That is what I would say on the two points the right to fish. I think has raised, and I hope, at any rate, that what I have said has not only what the limits of our position are, not only what the limits of our position must be, but also the limits within which we think we can do something to maintain British trade interests, and to maintain what hitherto has been regarded as the *status quo* in the Persian Gulf.

Colonel Fyfe moved to reduce the vote by 1000.

The committee will permit me, perhaps, to say a few words regarding the Bagdad Railway and certain of our interests in Persia. I do not intend on a formal information the giving of which would be incompatible with the public interest. But we all know that certain negotiations are going on, and we have had no information about those negotiations, as to which there need be no undue secrecy. If Germany and Turkey know that the British public is alive to the interests involved, I think it will certainly make them more careful in respect of the Bagdad Railway. We saw in the papers a day or two ago that there were British negotiations going on with Turkey with regard to the last section of the Bagdad Railway line from Bagdad down to the Gulf, and if I might say a word about that I should like to say that that section is of comparatively small interest.

It is quite independent of that section at the present time, and a concession with regard to steamers by which we can send our British and Indian goods and it is about Indian goods that I, as an old Indian officer, am most largely concerned. We can send our goods by another route in that case, but the section we are absolutely dependent upon is that section of the Bagdad Railway running north to a place called Sulaymaniyah, some 20 or 30 miles further up north of Bagdad, and thence by the branch line to Khamkin. All traffic which is too heavy or too bulky for mule or camel transport must go by sea to Basorah and thence by rivers and steamers to Bagdad and along the roads to Khamkin on the Persian frontier before it can be got into Persia. But when the Bagdad Railway is built these goods will all have to go by the railway from Bagdad to Khamkin. It is on this section of the railway that all that traffic, now worth £1,000,000 or more a year, must travel in the future. So far as British and Indian trade are concerned, therefore, it is necessary that there should be stipulations. In answer to my question yesterday the right honourable

"I would refer the honourable member to article 24 of the 'Cahier des Charges' attached to the Bagdad Railway convention of March 1903, which stipulates that all tariffs, whether general, special, proportional, or differential shall be applied to passengers and consignors of goods without distinction. The article further provides that all such tariffs must receive the approval of the Ottoman Government, which is bound to prevent all adverse treatment of British subjects in matters of commerce. His Majesty's Government will, of course, take steps, if they are required, to claim that the stipulation for fair treatment should be observed." (Official report, the 7th March, 1911, columns 1007-8.)

The right honourable gentleman was asked if the article in question prevents the imposition of preferential rates, but he was not able to give a definite reply to that. Therefore, with regard to British interests in the Bagdad Railway, I think it will be acknowledged that it is not only in the section from Bagdad down to the Gulf, but in the province of Bagdad to the north of the town of Khamkin, which includes the branch line to Khamkin.

Another point which we must always bear in mind, and that is, that our interests in the Bagdad province are of far longer standing and far superior to those of any other country. Our political resident is of longer standing and has a far superior position to the consuls-general of the other Powers. Our interest, and especially our Indian interests, comprise not only the ancient trade between India and Mesopotamia

to be considered, as well as the trade with Persia through Bagdad. Negotiations have been going on for many years regarding the junction of the Persian and Russian railways at Khamkin. We have not only to see that our trade is protected on the German portion of the line, but also on the Russian portion. In our arrangement with regard to Persia of August 1907, at that memorable conference then held, the two Governments of Great Britain and Russia recorded their desire for the permanent

have no information as to that, and I desire to know whether that recorded desire will really safeguard our trade with Persia. The line is said to be, and is, called an international line, but it has already met with considerable opposition in Russia itself from the merchants of Moscow and others who think their trade will be undermined, but so far as one can judge it really looks as if this line was calculated to give access to Russian goods to the markets of Southern Persia than to give access to British and Indian goods to Eastern and Northern Persia.

First of all, I understand British goods are not to be allowed to pass through in transit from Batoum, in the Black Sea, into Persia by this proposed line. Secondly, there is at present a considerable trade in British goods with Tabreez and North-East Persia by caravan from the Turkish port of Trebizond on the Black Sea, but Russia I understand, refuses to permit the building of a railway along this route to join up with the Trans-Persian line, by which this trade might be developed. The question is, what safeguard have we that the same route will not be shown towards the entry of British trade into Persia by the Bagdad-Khamkin route on the south-west, and on this point I trust we shall be given some reliable information. The whole future of the British and Indian trade with Persia depends largely on this point. As to the proposed junction of the Trans-Persian line with the Indian railways, the question is so much in the clouds at present that I need not pursue it further, but I would just mention that the Russian and Indian railways have different gauges—Russian gauge is 5 ft. 6 in., and where is the break of gauge to be? If to the south.

And all the advantage will be with Russia, she will have the population and productive parts of Persia opening up to her, while to India will be left the desert. It is, therefore, as if two Russian promoters are seeking to make what must be regarded as a Persian State railway to subserve Russian ends, and that the so-called international question is only a catchword.

There is one other point that concerns Persia, and that is the Muscat arms traffic. I have here the Muscat Consular Report for last year, 1909-10, just put in. In this it is stated that owing to the measures taken by the British and Persian Governments and the blockade on the littoral of the Persian Gulf to restrict the traffic, the export has declined to a great extent. This has resulted in a corresponding reduction in the import to Muscat, and the total value of imports for the year was Belgium, 35,000; United Kingdom, 23,000; Germany, 21,000; France, 15,000; Roumania, 8,000. Belgium heads the list, and Great Britain and Germany come next. France only sent 15,000, or under 15 per cent of the total imports, and yet I understand that at The Hague Conference, when other European Powers were willing to co-operate in putting a stop to this traffic, France was the only country to hold out, and by the dog-in-the-manger policy, despite the smallness of her interests is thus largely the cause of the present raiding and plundering and lawlessness throughout South-Eastern Persia and the Afghan hinterland. It is due to the selfish policy in this matter pursued by France that the British and Indian Governments are put to all the expense of their naval operations for the suppression of gun-running from Muscat to the Persian coast, which Persia by herself is utterly unable to prevent. Every outlaw, both in Persia and on the Afghan border, is now getting armed with modern small bore rifles of precision to the disturbance of the peace in all the country round. The Persian



Government we know are helpless, and yet this traffic in arms is just as disturbing as it is to our own Indian borderland. Why, therefore, have we done nothing to assist Persia in the matter in some really practical manner? I have here in the "Times" of the 4th March, headed, "Afghans pro-

Advices from the south show that Afghans are proceeding to the

hundred are in the neighbourhood of Bam and a much larger force is on

"In the present temper of the tribesmen the situation gives rise to anxiety

can raiders are invading Persia against the will of the Persian Government and yet we all know that the Persian Government have not got a whole of Southern Persia who dares to oppose the Persian to stop this invasion instead of waiting till these bands of reach the coast, where our men-of-war have to deal with them at sea. I remember when I was chief commissioner of Baluchistan a band of raiders invaded

and captured that fort, and killed or took prisoner every rider in it who entered on into Persia, and, acting in conjunction with the Persian governor and troops, reduced the raiders to order, and the northern frontier has been undisturbed in that way ever since. Why has not the same precedent been followed? As the Persian local governor is powerless to act alone, why have we not dealt with him? If I remember right an Indian regiment was once sent to Helmand, for the very purpose of stopping these Afghan raiders, and yet when it got to the frontier that regiment was put back to the sea frontier, and had to sit still. Afghan bands marched up with their raid

That is another business for Persia not for England. If France, in the face of

increased treaty with Muscat of fifty years ago, refused to permit the Sultan of Muscat to put any restriction on the import of arms into his own capital, a stoppage

One word as to the hardships and sufferings of our poor seamen engaged in putting down this gun running. No one who has not been in the Persian Gulf can have the faintest idea of the terrible heat of the summer there. You might as well put 100 men into an iron oven as into an iron gun boat to serve there. There is one good vessel the "Sphinx," a wooden ship with large gunboats, which is the only vessel fitted for the service. A water vessel belonging to the Indian Marine at one time had guns put into her and was ready for the work, but owing to the Admiralty to allow any Indian Marine ship to carry guns they had to be taken out the guns be put back into these ships. There should be no jealousy

use one as a naval ship and the other belongs to the Indian Marine. It would be much better if we could have some of our Indian boats back again—some good and wooden vessels which are quite competent to deal with Arab dhow and local tribesmen. Let us have wooden vessels for service on the gun-running blockade in the hot weather. I should say, given these boats and given assistance on land to the Persian Government, I see no reason whatever why we should not be able to put down this dangerous traffic. We have had more than one of our Indo-European telegraph stations and the houses of resident signallers threatened. It is a very great danger to us, and it is absolutely necessary that we should take steps in conjunction with Persia

put a stop to it at the earliest possible moment. The Persian Government is in the matter, and it depends on us whether we are to risk the cutting of the Persian telegraph line and the discontinuance of all telegraphic communication with Persia between Europe and India, and if we do nothing to put a stop to this we have but ourselves to blame. I therefore ask that this question may be taken into consideration, and any information which the right honourable gentleman can the subject we shall be very pleased to get.

Mr Noel Holton.—It is very welcome indeed to me, and I think to many members of the House, to find on the other side so great a solicitude for the welfare of our Indian borderland. I think we may congratulate ourselves also that the leader of the Opposition gave us a lead in venturing upon this very delicate field which is now occupied by questions affecting the

Near East. I feel myself that in venturing on this question we ought to feel a very great responsibility, and I think it to make up our minds that we will set before ourselves two conditions at least—that we will say nothing which can possibly be taken as offensive to any friendly Power, and, secondly, that we should purify our minds of any desire for making party points in a question of foreign relations.

is the first chance for a very long time that the House has had of expressing to the Government in what way it supports this policy. An opportunity for the expression of opinion is very rare, and of it to some extent last year was keenly felt, and if this is one of the allotted days of Supply it is very regrettable that the time all too short, should be encroached upon to so great an extent as it is to-day. I should like to say, not at all by way of criticism but by way of assuring the Foreign Secretary that he has very active and very keen support for his avowed policy, and I mean to some of us on this side that there are respects in which that policy is carried out so fully as we should be prepared to back it and see it carried out.

entirely agree with the framework of that policy, but, if I may quote a cynicism with which I entirely agree of Talleyrand in another connection, it is a good idea rather perfectly carried out in some respects—a cynicism which Talleyrand failed to establish, but which I hope I shall not fail to establish, because I speak with a great sense of responsibility in regard to one or two points in connection with the Foreign Secretary's policy. It is, I believe, an axiom that the Foreign Secretary is a trustee for a welfare of the nation and as such a trustee he cannot go to any extent beyond the views held by the people. I should like to assure him that in this policy, which is a

no will be well entitled to go further and to act with vigour in some particular directions.

To come at once to my illustrations. They are drawn from the field that we have been dwelling upon this evening, the Persian question, the Turkish question, and that question which is inextricably bound up with it, the German question. I wish to assure the right honourable Baronet of the feeling which is widely held on this side of the House, that the Persian question is in no sense a party question. We have in the speech just delivered that there is unanimity upon the main objects of the present Government. We all have some slight information, at least, of the strict aspects of the Persian question, and I am glad to thank from that speech that in both sides of the House there is felt a very keen interest also in the ancient civilisation and in the value to the world of preserving, if possible, that civilisation, and seeing prosper still further. There is no clash whatever to-day happily, between sentiment and interest in the question either of Persia or of Turkey. There have been clashes in the past when there was a great clash of sentiment and interest, but it is a very happy feature that to-day there is none at all. Two things have given rise to some dissimilarity on this side, and I dwell upon the matter, in our House, namely, the ultimatum, as it was called, last year, and the long negotiations which took place in connection with the Bank of Persia and the city house of Seligman. There is a very keen desire felt in the House

on which the Government should proceed is a desire to see the prosperity of Persia and a desire to bear in mind the interest and the value to the country of the Persian point of view, and the necessity of considering what is first of all for the good and the probable prosperity of Persia. There are objections raised of course, to the whole idea of perpetuating the state of Persia. There is the argument that Persia cannot govern herself. I do not desire to speak on any occasion without my book. I have never been in Persia, and I feel very much struck by the fact that some close observers

who not very long ago felt themselves at all, have changed their minds within the last year, and on the other side are very hopeful indeed.

There is the other argument that inevitably in course of time there must be encroachment upon Persia by the Russian Empire, but I see no inconsistency at all between friendship for Persian prosperity and friendship for Russia. The interests of the world are increasingly commercial, and the interests of the world are increasingly military.

tree commercial nations which are in the process of becoming more and more so. It is possible that the interests of our friendship with Russia, as we see with Persia, are perfectly compatible. There is an index that I would suggest the success of our policy in regard to Persia, and that in the self-respect of Persia I think there is particular need to be very cautious in conducting negotiations.

with such a State as that. One needs to be very cautious lest the way in which it should do something to injure the prestige and self-respect of the is more eniable than Sir George Bartlett.

This House would support a very great care for the self-respect of such a State as Turkey or Persia, and there is some danger that tendencies or prejudices, which are in some cases the peculiar property of Englishmen, may give rise to expressions which are misunderstood by such people as the Persians. I am sure the Foreign Secretary is glad that the House should cordially support the very

of a Power which she desires to see prosper. as to Turkey it suits our book that Turkey should be as that Persia should be prosperous. If Turkey is a civilised State we may say as we did in the case of Japan, abandon some of the rights which we under the stipulations, and we shall be glad as a nation to do so if and when it proper time arrives. There was a danger to the world arising from Turkey as the "sick man." There is always a danger in every to the unity of the sick man's relations, and there was such a d Turkey, and Turkey's recovery is a great boon to the world.

And it being a quarter past 8, and there being private business not down direction of the chairman of Ways and Means, under Standing Order No. 11, further proceeding was postponed.

#### Civil Service and Revenue Departments 1911-12

#### 1st Session 1911-12

Postponed proceedings on amendment (Colonel Yates) to reduce by 1000 the Vote of

#### Question again proposed. Debate resumed.

able members suspended to enquire upon outbreak of time which has taken place. this year in regard to opportunities for debating foreign policy which entirely absent last year. I was endeavouring to express the very keen support some of us feel on this side of the House of the Foreign Secretary's policy in its essence. It is to our minds a great idea, but somewhat imperfectly carried out, owing, I think, in great measure to that very absence of public discussion which would lend to it greater force and greater facility of expression. I take an example from our policy in relation to Turkey which is entirely laid up, in my judgment, with relations towards Germany. We have towards the subject populations of Turkey

relations resulting from our actions in the past and from our special treaty These obligations entitle us and compel us to pay very close attention to what is the nature of the Turkish Government. Our attitude towards the Turkish Government, which has been so happily expressed by the Foreign Secretary to-day, I think, now with our duty towards the subject population, and therefore I Government is justified in holding towards the Turkish Government cordial measure to-day. I am very glad

to this conclusion. I think during the last year or so the attitude of the Government has been rather too cold towards the Turkish Government. I think this is not justified by the defects and mistakes which during the past year. There was a time in the past when many of us express the strongest disapproval of cordial relations with Turkey when, in the words of a Turkish historian, using somewhat grim and entirely unconscious humour the Turks were accustomed to give to the Christians, as expressed it, the treatment which they were in any case to expect at the judgment

day. These days are happily passed, I believe, for ever. be somewhat more cordial in our most part young politicians, who have achieved the extraordinary Revolution. Let us give credit where credit is due, and not be loath to praise as well. This is a calculation of the psychological qualities of the Turks. We exercise influence with them, and we want to look after our interests, which in many cases joint interests with other countries, and I think that we are entitled to express an opinion slightly critical of that too English coldness which the Government has shown towards the Turk. I will quote an opinion, not to rely upon it, of a prominent leader of the Consular Bar in Constantinople, a man who has been honoured with the honour of a knighthood, and who has a strong opinion on the point which may interest the House.

There is an increasing number who believe that the Young Turks should be backed up, whilst they are also told of their blunders. My experience is, that they listen and attend when complaint is made by those in whose friendship they have

I am sure it is the wish of all parties in the House that they should have confidence in our friendship when it is based upon right conduct on their part. I think to extent, the Government has failed to convince them that they could proper circumstances, such that cordial friendship of ours. It is a very happy that that within the last few days the Foreign Secretary made a statement expressing his desire for the prosperity of Turkey, and a very happy comment has been made upon his expression of good will to the Turkish press. One paper expressed it, I think, in a

friendly with the conduct of other Powers, and it quoted a Turkish proverb, which runs "The friend adorns the enemy laughs in his sleeves." The policy of coldness and of rebuffs, I think, has not been a success, and if it has now been abandoned, I trust the Foreign Secretary will push his cordial attitude in a vigorous way. In Turkey, I think, we should be rather more active than we have been. I am not suggesting a policy of naive philanthropic adventure of any kind at all, but I would recall the English precedent which is one of the chief features of the history of English politics in Turkey, the precedent of one of our great Ambassadors. The British Ambassador at Constantinople may very well make himself a great friend of the Turk. I hope that that idea will be carried out in the future. I suggest one or two things of the manner in which that policy might be carried out. The honourable Member for Salisbury (Mr. Lloyd), whose knowledge and definition of views on these and other

highly entitle him to great influence upon this side of the House. shares with me, I believe, the idea that Great Britain has neglected an opportunity in Turkey in regard to the British school. Other Powers spend many times as much money as we do upon our British school. The Turks are very quick to note that we neglect our educational duties in their capital. I myself visited the school the other with the German and the French school, it has a more handful of Turkish scholars acquiring the English education which many Turks are very anxious to give to their sons. I suggest a sample of what might be done, and what I trust before long will be done in a larger measure. I w

the Foreign Secretary, that he is enquiring further from the

point. There is another thing which I think we might have done. The Government is very forward in making facilities for Turkish students to take Parts of the medical and the engineering schools, and I think, considering the of the English in Turkey, we might also do something of that kind. I think a immense underlying current of pro-English feeling, and considering the British policy in favour of Turkey, it is not wonderful that there is an incredible preference for the English. It should not be beyond the power of skill to take great advantage of that. Everyone in the House will recognise that will be brought to bear upon that subject by our present Ambassador, Sir Lowther. I hope that his orders and instructions are in that sense. What are the instructions of the German Ambassador is very evident to anyone acquainted with him and to anyone who has closely followed the activity which he displays, and the very frequent attentions which are showered upon Turkish politicians by the German and also the Austrian Embassy. It is very fortunate that our policy in Turkey need not in any sense at all be anti-German. A great statesman said that in Asia there is room for us all. I trust it may prove to be so, because it is perfectly true that, as a legiti-



state, commercial sense, in the Near East there is room for all the energies which have been not only complacent lookers on at German industry, but positively the backers and instigators of German enterprise. It will be a great disaster if, in connection with this most delicate question of the Bagdad Railway, we are all at once by any sort of fear

led by blind fear

giving way to it? I will say no more in the Bagdad Railway question, we all hope, is in the subject of negotiation, and in my judgment it is. Though I share the hatred he expressed the other night of the

think we may assure the Government that they will find very cordial support if they

the way of a general settlement of the Bagdad Railway

you desire that it should be paid

as by obvious as to the relations in which this question involves. You cannot separate the Persian question, the Turkish question, and the German question. They are the same, and the same to them all. I venture to think that the friendly policy laid down by the Secretary would find even more support if discussion were invited and

ally than it has done to the moment. What we want to see

of sympathy, and if there is to be any sort of greater vigour

be expressed by the diplomatists who represent England in those

It is a policy which I think justifies even

implies greater activity even on the part of the F

reducing public opinion. It is a policy for which I believe the

leading on both sides of the House which would justify him in exercising

activity. This whole field of difficulties requires, as you will obviously see, a series of agreements which would form the basis of better relations. You cannot in relations with Germany until matters are set straight in regard to Turkey in Persia and conversely you cannot set things straight in Turkey and Persia unless on good relations with Germany. This is the policy avowed by the Government

but there is talk now of bringing these long dragging negotiations

to an agreement. Everyone is delighted to think that a specific agreement come to at no very distant date, but the Foreign Secretary has the public at his back. I venture to say, if he pushed on the negotiations an agreement, because the public hope not only for their improvement in regard to Anglo-German relations, but the trouble which exists

regard to these questions of strained relations, which are matters of notoriety, is that been at certain moments not only a disaster to the two countries but that they are a disaster in other countries, and especially in Turkey.

The state of irritation and the fear of conceivable conflict

convinces besides it

at any disposition and the military action

country. It derives the main part of its force from it

there might conceivably be a great conflict, and that a conflict is frequently talked about. It is that which encourages militarism in many a country. But the business I am concerned with is rather the discouragement of it in Turkey. We are

to support the more conciliatory party in Turkey. In order that it may

top it is necessary that it

list of factors which govern political forces in that country. It seems to me that it

is really the navy question, and I trust that agreements will be announced in the

very distant future which will constitute what I remember not very long ago

Secretary described as a relative to a somewhat inflamed situation

ght to be brought about by an improvement of the

and expenditure of all parties, and yet maintaining what I myself desire to

see what the Prime Minister has called a supremacy intact, unassailable, unchangeable, and unchallenged.

There is a general difficulty, I think, arising to some extent from the English type

of mind. There are some habits of English diplomacy which in my judgment are too

English. I will not at this hour encroach on your time by going into details of what

I mean. It is in any case a very difficult matter to explain. But there are habits of

mind of the English which to some extent interfere with what we all profess to

in our foreign policy—the practice of sympathetic activity towards both the weak races and towards the Great Power which is the subject of discussion along with them, that is a school which depreciates the power of words and ideas, and therefore reduces the whole of its national valuation to a matter of mathematical calculation, which says that A is able to beat B, and C is not able or willing to come to the rescue of B, and therefore it is inevitable that there will be a conflict. But everyone knows that in fact nothing is more untrue. If it were true there would be perpetual war. That school of thought which denies the power of words and ideas is condemned by the whole trend of modern scientific and ignorant. At all events, that is a school to which the leader of the Opposition does not belong, and I do not think that we need despair of finding that he

the long run govern the relations of Europe. I shall be asked for practical proposals

I want to suggest that there is a case for a definite propaganda. The Government has

earned very great credit by its establishment, for instance, of a

entertainment fund and by the international exhibition committee. These are

where I am sure cordially welcome. If money is spent upon them

the end is a greater economy than the spending of that money. We have made great

progress in social life. I think a corresponding progress has not been made in inter-

national life in the positive construction of peaceful ideas which Foreign Secretaries

Ministers might set themselves to carry out. This is not a sentimental idea. I think

we have gone back to some extent from the level which had been reached half-a-century

ago. I would like to appeal to a precedent to show that the new fact is not in the

propaganda of peace, but in the decay of these propaganda. Let me give an example

to it from the sort of view which Foreign Secretaries took fifty or sixty years ago.

In 1843 Sir Robert Peel was writing M. Guizot, the great French Minister, and he

"Our united labours for the last few years have established founda-

strong enough to bear the shock of all ordinary casualties. We have succeeded

in elevating the tone and spirit of the nations; have taught them to regard something

higher than paltry jealousies and hostile rivalries, and to esteem and find fully all that

moral and social influence which cordial relations between the countries give to each for

very good and beneficent purposes."

the activity

ght be given

at the Guildhall last autumn;

and to quote the level which has been reached by the

von Bismarck (H. Swag), and I do think that is a thing which requires saying to

much and very urgently. If there is in Germany a feeling that there is some-

thing ought to be better understood by England, though we are to some extent

ourselves to blame for the misapprehension which exists, it is a misapprehension of the

every possible means of what in the feeling of this country, and that feeling, I

I may say, in one of cordial appreciation for all genuine progress in any legitimate way

in any nation, especially that one which is perhaps, of all others, most akin to ourselves.

It is the feeling which would regard an attack upon an ostensibly friendly nation as an

execrable and, in the strictest sense, a dishonourable act, an act which must be condemned

by the conscience that guides not only educated men, but guides the man in the street.

A workman does not kill his rival who gets the job, even when there is no other job to

that is the feeling which I think actuates the working classes, and I believe

the feeling of the working classes could be brought in with international advantage.

They agree that war is all very well for the swells, but poor men must help each other.

I think it is

taken of showing the cordial co-operation we wish to manifest in German affairs when

occasions arise to join in exhibitions in Germany. I regret very much that action has

not been taken this year to join in the exhibition of hygiene at Dresden. That is a

small point, but it is an illustration. There is one other idea. This necessity for

agreement; has it very long been felt, and is there no possibility now of a special

commission such as in the past has not been unheard of in the course of international

negotiations? Is it not possible now, when things are dragging so very long, to have

a special commission to Berlin, or a special conference in London if ordinary diplomatic

machinery is not adequate? No one has greater gifts for such a mission than the

[1773]

21

Foreign Secretary all sides of the House agree. There is a precedent for such a mission in the visit of Lord Beaconsfield to Berlin. There is another and more closely similar precedent in the mission of the Duke of Wellington to St Petersburg in 1822. He was not Foreign Secretary, but he was from Lord Liverpool's Government. If such a precedent were followed, and there might be an attempt to accomplish general agreement with Germany who could more perfectly perform the task than the Minister so renowned for his intimacy with German life and German people as the Minister of State?

Ministers are overworked. So they are, but how can help be given them to make up for the overwhelming situation in which they find themselves. I venture to think that the solution lies in the greater publicity and greater positive invitation to public feeling on the part of Ministers, less in fuller discussion in this House, which

entailed by comparison with the past in recent times. Why should we not

existence the new world to redress the balance of the work. I think it is a matter of education, and how is education to be given? It is a matter of education, and how is education to be given? It is a matter of education, and how is education to be given?

Diplomacy has a very old tradition and a very long history. It is represented in our case by a very small service of a very high order of merit compared with other services. They lead a life isolated, they are underpaid, they are extremely able and extremely charming, but what have they to help them in their work by way of the influence of public opinion?

It would be an immense assistance to diplomats in every part of the world and to the Foreign Secretary. We all know that public opinion, if it had had its way in time past, would have saved us very great blunders.

It undoubtedly have saved us from the Crimean war. We are dealing today with hard facts. We are dealing with estimates, and we are asked this year to spend no less a sum than \$28,000,000 upon these negotiations between States quite apart from any war expenditure. Sir Robert Peel, in his last speech in the debate in 1850, said—

"Diplomacy is a costly engine for maintaining peace and a remarkable instrument used by civilized nations for the purpose of preventing war. Unless it be used to suppress the angry passions of individual men, and I am not using a precedent of a party character, but one that would be recognized by all classes, unless it is used to check feeling which arises out of national sentiment, it is an instrument not only costly, but mischievous."

He said it in 1850. I hope we have not since then allowed it to be used in the short time at our disposal to pass from the atmosphere of inoffensive amiability into which we have been changed

metamorphosed with regard to the Bagdad Railway. The honourable member opposite Mr. Noel Buxton declared that in Asia there was room for all of us. If that statement included the Persian Gulf, we on this side should give it an emphatic assent.

It is from that point of view that I welcome the statement that we have given on the Persian Gulf politically speaking, there is no room for any two competing nations at the mouth of the Persian Gulf. It is from that point of view that I welcome the statement that we have given on the Persian Gulf politically speaking, there is no room for any two competing nations at the mouth of the Persian Gulf.

Secretary for Foreign Affairs was good enough to inform me that there was no need whatever to make any reiteration of our policy, because no changes whatever had taken place to make such a reiteration necessary. At the time at which I spoke we had recently heard from the press that certain negotiations between Russia and Germany were actually in progress. I do not know if he suggested then that those negotiations in no way altered the position. If he did, I can only say that his statement met with considerable criticism in the press of France and Germany, which is leading articles depicted his silence as being "designed, abnormal, and very regrettable." I do not know if he would consider the Russo-German negotiations, which vitally affect our position on the Bagdad line, to be of no interest to this country. I am glad to think that to night the Foreign Secretary has given us some undertaking, if not a completely satisfactory one, that the matter is having some attention.

I had hoped to-night to give some history of the present situation with regard to the Bagdad Railway. Unfortunately, there is no time to do so, and I will pass

directly to the main point which affects this country commercially, and that is the Kharankin line, which the leader of the Opposition introduced to our notice in 1900. Before doing so, I will just remind the committee that there is

another branch of the Bagdad Railway which is of some considerable importance to this country, from quite a different point of view, namely, the branch which connects a short time connect the main trunk line between Constantinople and Bagdad with the line at Kilis and Aleppo. This, perhaps, is not a matter of very

concern, but in reference to it I will call the attention of the

gentleman to a very interesting monograph recently published in its second edition by an eminent German economist. From that monograph

that in Germany the Germans themselves attributed great importance to the Syrian line with the main Bagdad line, because the

places—one in Egypt and one in Turkey, and through Turkey, would be useful to Turkey, and through Turkey, would be useful to Turkey,

if at any time such a line were needed for strategic purposes. I do not know upon that. I think those who remember the negotiations upon the Egyptian incident as well as I do, and remember what took place with respect to the Egyptian

ly and purely commercial question regarding the Kharankin line, I would ask the right honourable gentleman's attention to the answer he gave to a question put by the honourable friend the Member for Milton, as to what he was going to do to our interests on the Bagdad Kharankin line. The substance of the right

honourable gentleman's answer was that in article 24 of the Convention of 1903

do security against discriminatory tariffs. The right honourable gentleman the leader of the Opposition made the point that the right honourable gentleman had not quoted in full this 24th article, and had

omitted out a very important part. The Foreign Secretary told us that the article provided that those tariffs, whether they be differential or not, admitted the principle of equality to all nations, but he forgot to tell us

that it was not to be applied to the Imperial commonwealth. If the right honourable

gentleman is going to have the whole million pound worth of trade on the reading of article 24 of the "Causes des Charges," which in cases of urgency do not have to be referred to the Ottoman Government at all, I think it is a very slender scheme. I think Manchester merchants, traders, and workpeople will have a good deal to

say. The right honourable gentleman has to say as to our trade. There is nothing that can possibly safeguard our trade in that particular.

The right honourable gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, pointed out clearly

perfectly possible for a German railway which may be constructed there to keep within the terms of this article 24, and yet impose a tariff which can be completely discriminatory against British goods.

Let us take the case of articles going up by that line. The goods that go up the Persian Gulf and by the British line and

the Kharankin route are cotton goods. The main German goods that go are of very small value, and are generally known as fancy, or cheap, goods. I put it to the honourable gentleman opposite: What on earth is there to prevent on that German railway a very low nominal tariff being put on those goods in which Germany is interested, and a prohibitory tariff on those goods in which Britain is interested?

I think it is absolutely nothing.

It is the old most-favoured-nation clause illusion! I shall be very interested to

ask the Foreign Secretary in what way he thinks we can safeguard our trade. The Foreign Secretary twitted the right honourable gentleman, the leader of the

opposition, the status quo with regard to the Bagdad Railway with regard to the safeguarding of our trade on the Kharankin line. I can give him an answer. I would ask him whether he thinks, to use a slang phrase, that "the game is quite up" on the Kharankin line? I do not. I think there is a great deal to be done in negotiation in regard to getting equal terms in the control of the Kharankin line. I am quite prepared, as I have done before, to show him the means by which I think it can be brought about.

Sir E. Grey.—What means?

Mr. Lloyd.—By building from Coolamari, below Bagdad, which would give our trade free entry to the Persian Gulf.

Sir E. Grey.—The honourable gentleman says I twitted the leader of the



Opposition for not having made a suggestion, but I went on to make a suggestion of my own, which would be under our control for British trade.

The gentleman is quite prepared to lose his whole getting such concessions as will safeguard our own trade. I suggest one for to Bagdad. I hope the right honourable gentleman will give us an but the claim will be pressed for an alternative railway to the in Gulf, a railway that would safeguard our trade from any di- on the Kairouan line. So far we have trade.

—I attach great importance to the suggestion. as to the possibility of other routes, which I think the hon- might not to ignore, but I do not propose to prejudice in advance the steps we may take in that direction by specifying beforehand the particular applications we may make.

Mr. Lloyd.—I quite understand that, and I should not like to press the right- ousable gentleman in any matter of foreign policy to specify in detail what he is to do in the future, but he deliberately challenged us to give him an to what we should do. We should not have ourselves have brought up the

I am not in the least complaining of the honourable member's suggestion. I make no complaint of his suggestion.

Mr. Lloyd.—The right honourable gentleman challenged us absolutely and ente- getically to provide a solution, and he twitted the leader of the Opposition for not do any suggestion. I provide a suggestion, and when I do so the right- ableman says we do not propose to prejudice in advance the negotia- g on. From that point of view it is not a tolerable position. I have

intend, as I believe the right trade is properly safeguarded being this only ten iv of us criticised so bitterly add the whole of the route

the last five years since the present Government came it will be divided up in Persia and will be given

notice to the German Government. To many of us that is an intol- position for British trade, and we see no justification whatever for it. I the arguments put forward in connection with the Anglo-Russian concession, when we were told in neutral areas there was no reason why we should not have equal rights in Russia. The right honourable gentleman has forgotten he has allowed all the to be included in the Russian sphere; and you cannot build a railway from town to a spot in the desert, and that is what you have left in the northern at the present time. I wish to ask the right honourable gentleman e other point in regard to the Bagdad-Khankin route. I want him to

I look to the days of Lord Stratford Canning and his correspondence with regard to another great trade route which he created, and which has been of great value to British trade. I refer to the route through Trebizond, Erzer- Tabreez, and Teluk, from the Black Sea into Northern Persia. If the

honourable Baronet takes the days and the pains taken to form that route for the he will look at that route to-day, and see what has happened to it by following the pany of natural channels, he will see that, year by year, while the trade of Trebizond increases, our trade decreases annually owing to Russian subsidies and our own apathy with regard to this particular route. The trade there is measured by transport capacity, and only fourteen years ago 40,000 camels a-year were being loaded up with British goods to take into Persia. Only three years ago that total of 40,000 had route has practically been abandoned in regard to British trade, and if the right

in the opening lines that he has a very unsatisfactory year to record, because British trade has sunk while Russian trade has increased. According to the right honourable

Russian trade has increased by 375 per cent. If the right honourable gentleman finds any satisfaction in that state of things in Persia with regard to our trade, then

I cannot agree with him. I think it most deplorable, and I hope measures to secure our trade interests will be taken in connection with the Bagdad-Khankin line, or any other subsidiary line, by the Foreign Office.

Lastly, I wish to refer to the political situation that obtains below Bagdad. I think the leader of the Opposition has stated the case very plainly to-night. We all agree that, so far as the Bagdad Railway is within Turkish territory, we can have no real decisive claims upon it, but we may negotiate in respect of our old privileges and the old historic character of our relations with Turkey below Bagdad on the Tigris River and any other portions. But once we come to negotiate with regard to Koweit itself the matter is entirely different. The right honourable Baronet has given us a very unsatisfactory statement with regard to Koweit. I regret it was not given earlier. When the Foreign Secretary asks us whether there is anything which can be done to stop those measures which have been taken against us in that part of

reply that if he would occasionally treat this House with a little would make some open statement of the continuity of foreign

policy which is desired. I do not wish to get details of an embarrassing nature from the right honourable gentle- man, as he knows very well, as I have on one or two occasions, and failed to get it, he would do a service to this country by stopping the machinations of other foreign nations with regard to our diplomacy in the East. I remember very well when I made a speech

opposite with criticisms, and it was with great reluctance he made any statement at all. What was the result of the statement he made? The result of the statement, which, if I may use the word with all courtesy, he was compelled to make by my speech in the House, was that in all the main newspapers in Europe it was said the right honourable gentleman's speech had allayed anxiety in the East, and largely conduced to a peaceful settlement of that very difficult question. I adduce that as a proof that, if occasionally when we call as we have every right to do, for a statement of the continuity of foreign policy in this House, the right honourable gentleman could meet us with a little more candour than he has in the past it would be an advantage. In conclusion, with

territory just as it is. It has been independent territory, and avowed as

an claim absolutely nothing. It has been independent territory, and avowed as such in this House and in England for many a long year past, and the sooner that in

domestic policy I have worked very hard for many a long year past as they know, the

policy I have worked very hard for many a long year past as they know, the

The sooner that is done, and it can only be done by the most firm attitude on our part, the sooner we shall have better relations with Germany, and not until then.

Mr. James Hope. Last year we had no Foreign Office Vote put down at all, and no proper discussion on foreign affairs. Today the discussion has been interrupted by other business both in the afternoon and in the evening, and I would ask the right

honourable Baronet to use his influence with the Prime Minister, so that the Foreign Office Vote shall be put down on the earliest possible Thursday.

Mr. K. G. G. I quite agree that the discussion has been very much interrupted. Of course, I cannot undertake to say when the Foreign Office Vote will be taken, but I

understand that the general convenience of the House is consulted through the usual channel, and it will be so in this case. The fact that the discussion has been interrupted to-night will no doubt be taken into consideration.

Mr. James Hope. Will the right honourable Baronet do his best?

Question put: "That item class 2, Vote 3 (Foreign Office), be reduced by 100."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 89, Noes, 232.

9044]

No. 154

Lord Grimthorpe to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 11.)

My dear Grey,

80, Portland Place, W., March

MANY thanks for your letter of the 8th instant. Whether the Government will offer such terms as to make it worth our while to build the Bagdad Railway, I will not fail to let you know what they are before we sign the contract.

Yours very truly

GRIMTHORPE.

[9061

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 11.)

(No. 54. Secret.)

(Telegraphic) P

St. Petersburg, March 11, 1911.

PELUSIAN railways. My telegram No. 54, Secret, of the 10th March.

I shall shortly have to ask for an interview with M. Stolypin in order to speak to him about the extension of the fishery limit. Would you wish me to take the opportunity of broaching the question of the Mohammedan Railway to him? If it is the wish of His Majesty's Government to ask for the concession for it, I might explain to M. Stolypin our reasons, and say that I hoped there would be no objections on the part of the Russian Government. I might add that the whole question with them before proceeding to construct the

The matter will have to be submitted by M. Stolypin to the Council of Ministers, and, if you approve the above suggestion, it would therefore, be advisable for me to furnish him with a confidential memorandum setting forth any views that I may be instructed to express to his Excellency.

8930]

No. 154

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Louthen

(No. 63.)

(Telegraphic) P

Foreign Office, March 11, 1911.

BAGHDAD Railway. Your telegram No. 58.

You may choose the exact form which your communication may take, but it is essential that it should be made in writing and in a form which will put it on record at the Porte, as they have persistently refused to take any notice of our proposals. The memorandum handed to Ottoman Minister of Finance on the 29th about Egyptian borrowing powers is not a

[9085]

No. 155

Sir E. Louthen to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 85.)

Sir,

Berlin, March 10, 1911

I HAVE the honour to report that your speech in the House of Commons on the subject of the Bagdad Railway and Koweit questions has, according to the "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," made a very favourable impression in official circles. "Your statesmanlike speech," that paper says, "clearly shows the lines on which an understanding can be discussed and arrived at, both as regards the raising of the

The Imperial Chancellor told me this evening that it was he himself who had caused this paragraph to be inserted, and he asked me to tell you how much he appreciated your clear and conciliatory language on these two questions. His Excellency also said that he was glad to be able to say that he noted a general

improvement in the relations between the two countries. This opinion was, he told me, shared by Count Meternich, whom no one could ever accuse of exaggerated optimism.

The Chancellor did not mention the question of Koweit, but the press this morning has much to say on the subject. As the messenger leaves to-morrow morning, I have a time to give more than the briefest summary of their remarks. The "Vossische Zeitung" says, while expressing itself very favourably as regards your statement regarding the Bagdad Railway, that it cannot on the other hand agree with your observations respecting Koweit. It says that though the Turkish sovereignty over Koweit has for many years laid dormant it nevertheless exists, and that though through this sovereignty not having been made effective Great Britain has been able to obtain the treaties she has made with the Sheikh of Koweit cannot be held good, as they are not recognised by Turkey. It adds that things now are not as they were, and that with the regeneration of Turkey, a thorough examination and exchange of subject between the two Powers concerned cannot be much

The "Kreuz Zeitung," at the close of a long historical article on the subject of Great Britain in the Persian Gulf, says that the necessity of putting an end to all doubts on this question has now become acute, and that, as it is in itself a question of right, the Court of Arbitration at The Hague would seem to be the proper place to have the matter definitely thrashed out. It adds that though it can hardly be supposed that as the first and foremost champion of the principle of arbitration, Great Britain could refuse such a proposal were it to be made to her by Turkey, still it cannot be denied that there are certain difficulties arising out of the general situation which stand in the way of such a solution.

In a second article on the same subject, the "Kreuz," after scolding at the British idea that in this question Germany stands behind Turkey, quotes largely from Mahan's articles, and especially from an article by that writer in the "Navy" of September 1902, in which he comes to the conclusion that as long as Germany's nearest harbour to the Persian Gulf lies in the North Sea, the Bagdad Railway, as far as that Power is concerned, constitutes strategically no danger to Great Britain. The "Kreuz Zeitung" says that Englishmen will not fail to remark that Mahan's article was written before Germany commenced to build Dreadnoughts, and that the situation has thereby been changed, and it adds that articles have appeared in the British press to the effect that, though Great Britain has the power to maintain her position in the Persian Gulf, it can only be done by weakening her naval strength in Home waters. This argument, the "Kreuz" observes, applies in a far greater measure to Germany, for if she detach even a fairly strong squadron to the Persian Gulf, how could she possibly defend her coasts against an attack by the British fleet?

The article then says: "If we understand the policy of Great Britain in the Persian Gulf, we must see that it is to secure the free passage of the great sea routes from the Suez Canal to the East. An effective means for realising this idea would be to set up a new Aden or Gibraltar, either on Persian or Arabian territory, at the entrance to the Gulf. In this case France would have to be induced to sell her treaty rights in Oman, perhaps, also, in spite of the misunderstanding of 1907, Russian might raise diplomatic difficulties. Still, the idea is not new, and the creation of British spheres of influence in Persia may have been a preliminary to such a step should events render it necessary. Another way would be the formation of a strong naval squadron, with its base on the Indian coast, whose duty it would be to close the entrance to the Gulf when necessary. In both cases Great Britain would be true to her traditional policy of letting no straits or narrow seas of any strategic importance fall into the hands of a great sea power. Both of these methods would, of course, cost a great deal of money, and would be a heavy charge on both the English and Indian exchequers, they would, moreover, necessarily give rise to considerable difficulties and

There is, however, a third way for Great Britain to realise her aims if she really considers it so vital to her interests to keep any foreign maritime Power out of the Persian Gulf. It is, perhaps, open to her to arrive at that result by diplomatic means. Whether Russia would lend herself to an arrangement on the lines desired by England is a question by itself. First and foremost it is a question between Great Britain and Germany, and as Germany's interests in the East are of a commercial and not a political nature, an understanding between the two Powers on the subject of the Persian Gulf would appear to be by no means impossible.

The particular question of Koweit is in itself a juridical matter—a question of



rights. If, as such, it was an isolated question, Turkey could not do better than propose to Great Britain that it should be referred to The Hague tribunal. It is, however, not an isolated question, but one closely bound up with the numerous political and strategical problems of the Persian Gulf. But the whole Koweit question would lose its importance, and the solution of the southern section of the Bagdad Railway become comparatively easy, if only an Anglo-German Persian Gulf understanding could be arranged which would pay due regard to Great Britain's special position and her political and strategic interests."

This is the concluding sentence of the article, and there is no mention of what concessions or advantages Germany would, in the writer's opinion, expect to gain from such an understanding. As, however, the article from which I have quoted is one of a series, the German side of the question may possibly appear in a subsequent issue of the Kreuz-Zeitung.

I have, &c.  
(for the Ambassador),  
R. S. SYMONS.

[9220]

No. 156

Sir R. Goschen to Sir Edward Grey. (Received March 13.)

(No. 66.)

Sir,

The *Deutsche Tageszeitung* in its recent article in the German organ on the Bagdad Railway question (see my despatch No. 55 of the 1st inst.), has had the effect in England of a salutary cold douche, and that its clear statement of facts is a welcome change from the endless talk in the British press about "undoubted claims" and "well founded" rights. Regret is then expressed that the article in the "Frankfurter Zeitung" (enclosed in my despatch of the 1st inst.), was not more fully quoted in English newspapers, as the "Times" considers that the explanations of that organ were of a nature to make the case particularly clear to the average Englishman, which was extremely desirable in view of the fact that the opinion had been expressed repeatedly by English writers that the establishment of a "German tribunal" on the Persian Gulf would be intolerable to England.

After reproducing several passages from English press articles on the vexed question of Koweit, the "Tageszeitung" observes that England might perhaps be ready to give evidence of her friendliness towards Turkey by publishing the terms of her amiable agreement with it.

I have, &c.  
W. E. GOSCHEN.

[9298]

No. 11

Extract from the "Times" of March 11. (Received March 13, 1911.)

The Bagdad Railway. Germany and Sir Edward Grey's Speech

A CHARGE OF FRONT

From our own Correspondent.

Berlin, March 10, 1911.

THE "North German Gazette" publishes the following semi-official note this evening:

"The statesmanlike utterances ('die in staatsmännischem Geiste gehaltenen Ausführungen') of the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, in regard to the Bagdad Railway question have made a very favourable impression in Government circles in Berlin. The statements of the British Minister point the road by which an

agreement can be prepared and arrived at ('angebahnt und erreicht') both in the question of the increase of the customs and with regard to the carrying out of the construction of the line from Bagdad to the Gulf."

It is unofficially stated that the Emperor William had a long conversation this morning with the German Foreign Secretary, Herr von Kiderlen-Waschwer.

[9299]

No. 1

Extract from the "Times" of March 13, 1911. (Received at Foreign Office, March 13.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES"

IT has been announced that negotiations are about to take place between the Ottoman and British Governments with reference to Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf, the question of the terminal section of the Bagdad Railway.

Those who desire the removal of causes of friction between the three countries concerned (the United Kingdom, Turkey, and Germany) must hope that these negotiations will be successful. But the public will have a voice in the matter, and agreement will be difficult unless public opinion in the three countries can free itself from prejudice and misapprehensions, and can appreciate the position of the other parties.

There are several aspects of the question which invite comment from this point of view, but I do not venture to ask you for space to deal with more than one such matter—the kilometre guarantee.

"Kilometre guarantees" have acquired a bad name. They are habitually implying moral obliquity in anyone who has anything to do with them. A recent leading article, has described them as "iniquitous."

Mr. Lloyd, M.P., in the House of Commons expressed a hope that we should refrain from "snatching our fingers" with them. The "Spectator" reserves for them its most solemn tone.

I venture to assert, without fear of contradiction, that there are hardly any railways in Turkey which can be built without a guarantee of some kind, since the prospects of traffic at the outset are not sufficiently good to cover working expenses and give even the most moderate remuneration to the capital employed. It is frequently stated, with an air of superiority, that the Smyrna Aidin Railway (the only British-owned railway in Turkey) has no guarantee. This line serves one of the most fertile and best cultivated districts in Turkey, but during the first thirty-two years of its existence it was in receipt of a guarantee. Some other railways (such as the Salonica Monastir Railway) may prove remunerative, apart from a guarantee, after they have been working for a certain time. But, broadly speaking, it may be said that in Turkey, as in India and many other undeveloped countries, Government guarantees of one kind or other are indispensable if the country is to be opened up by railways. In such circumstances, it is unreasonable to criticise the Government for offering, or for accepting, such guarantees.

Apart, however, from the general question, the guarantees for the Bagdad Railway have been attacked as "iniquitous" on the ground that they are excessive and vicious in form. I do not say that the arrangement is the best that could be devised in the interests of either of the parties, but an examination of the figures will show that there has been much exaggeration on the part of the critics.

The guarantee of the Bagdad Railway is divided into two parts. The first relates to the construction of the railway, the second to its working. As regards construction, the Turkish Government lends over to the concessionnaire company for each kilometre of line built Government 4 per cent. bonds to the nominal value of 10,764l., requiring an annuity of 440l. for interest and sinking fund. The cash equivalent of these bonds at the present level of Turkish credit may be taken as about 8,500l. For this sum the line has to be built and provided with rolling stock. The specification for the building is a very stringent one. It provides for 75-lb. rails and a speed throughout of 75 kilom. per hour, including stoppages. The company has to meet the charge for interest on the bonds for each section during construction. The company also takes the risk of any fall in Turkish credit, which would diminish the cash proceeds of the bonds. The railway, when completed, is the property of the Government.

"1773"

2 L

There is no doubt that in the easier sections of the line the sum available will be an ample margin, and it is mainly on an estimate of the cost in the easier sections that the balance is based. But there is equally no doubt that there are other sections such as that now being constructed through the Taurus Mountains, where there will be a substantial deficit.

It is probable that on the whole undertaking there will be a substantial deficit, indeed, if it were otherwise, no one would have accepted it. But even if this balance should amount eventually to 15 or 20 per cent. of the whole cost to the Government (and it is improbable that it will be more than this), it is contended by the concessionaires that this is not an excessive margin of safety for those who undertake to carry through an enterprise costing some £4,000,000, extending, perhaps, over fifteen or twenty years, and depending for its successful prosecution on the maintenance during that period of Turkish credit.

It is legitimate to differ as to the precise margin required, but such difference does not justify or excuse charges of extortion or imposition.

The second part of the guarantee relates to the arrangements for working the line. The Government guarantees to the company a minimum of 1,800 fr. (180l.) per kilometre, that is to say, if the gross traffic receipts are less than that amount the Government makes up the deficit. Thus, if the receipts amount to exactly 1,800 fr. per kilometre the Government has nothing to pay and nothing to receive in respect of the working. All receipts above 1,800 fr. per kilometre go to the company, and all receipts below 1,800 fr. per kilometre are paid by the Government.

Such sums as may accrue to the Government from the traffic receipts are payable for the construction of the line. Thus, if the gross receipts should ever amount to as much as 2,000 fr. (200l.) per kilometre per annum, the Government's share would be 200 fr. (20l.) per kilometre (2,000 - 1,800 = 200). At this point the railway would not only be earning enough to pay for its own construction, but would have become a source of direct profit to the Government.

It is favourable to the Government and unfavourable to the concessionaires for defects previously the opposite of those alleged in the construction guarantee. It is pointed out that the share assigned to the company will hardly suffice (except where the traffic is very small) to meet the cost of working, and that consequently it does not offer an incentive to the company to foster traffic. There is some truth in this, and it is obviously expedient, in the interest of all parties, that the working company should have a strong interest in developing the traffic. It would be to the advantage of the Baghdad Railway Company to secure a share of the traffic receipts if it could be obtained without a disproportionate sacrifice in other respects, but whether the Ottoman Government would see the advantages of such a modification with sufficient clearness to induce them to relinquish a share of the traffic receipts is more doubtful. In any case, there is no ground for accusing the concessionaires of having obtained an unfair and extortionate advantage.

This brief analysis of the guarantee shows, I think, that the indignation of the concessionaires is based on a very one-sided view of the facts. In any case the result is deplorable. The Turks themselves, while regretting that a better bargain was made when the concession was granted, fully recognise its validity. Moreover, they are anxious to see the railway constructed. They are therefore by no means to be blamed for obstructing the completion of the line by way of showing gratitude to themselves for the protection of their interests in a matter which does not directly concern us. The Germans, not unnaturally, perhaps, doubt whether we should be at such pains to protect the Turkish Treasury if we were not hostile to the enterprise on other grounds. It is necessary for us to recognise that by covering the present holders of the concession with reproaches, which they strongly resent, we do not facilitate the remodelling of the scheme on lines which would remove our objections to it, especially as the concessionaires would feel that by inviting most激烈的 of the present contract they might be taken to admit that the attacks on it are well founded.

with good-will, but such language as has been used about the enterprise tends to create an atmosphere of hostility, and so renders the solution more difficult. I am, &c.

9316

N. 100

Times" of March 12.—(Received at Foreign Office March 13)

# THE BAGHDAD RAILWAY—TURKISH VIEWS.

For the utmost secrecy has been maintained with regard to the progress of the negotiations between the Baghdad Railway Company and the Porte. As for the proposals between Great Britain and Turkey on the questions connected with the Persian Gulf and the prolongation of the railway south of Baghdad, all that can be said is that Kifayat Pasha has submitted certain proposals on behalf of the Ottoman Government.

In some influential Young Turk circles the view seems to be held that the result of these negotiations will depend entirely on the settlement in a manner favourable to the Turkish claims, of the Kuwait question. In the case of such a settlement, the Porte is likely to agree to the internationalisation of the terminal section of the Baghdad Railway from Baghdad to Kuwait on the basis of a measure of participation in the financial control of that section. Such control it would desire should be shared by England, France, Germany, and Turkey.

Failing such a settlement of the Kuwait question, the concession for the construction of the Gulf section will, it is thought, be granted exclusively to the Baghdad Railway Company, and the terminus of the line would be established either at Basorah or at a point on the coast of the Persian Gulf north of Kuwait, such as Umm Khar or Khor Abdallah, both of which are considered here to be Turkish territory.

Constantinople, March 12, 1911

[9344]

No. 100

Sir, I enclose to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 11)

(No. 151)

Constantinople, March 10, 1911

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith translation of an article by H. J. J. in to-day's "Tanin" on the subject of the Baghdad Railway and the 4 per cent. of customs duty, entitled "Fresh Statements by Sir Edward Grey."

I have &amp;c.

CARD TOWELL

Enclosure in No. 100.

Full Summary of Hassan Jahel's Leading Article in the "Tanin" of March 10, 1911. (Translation.)

## FRESH STATEMENTS BY SIR EDWARD GREY

WE know by experience that mistakes sometimes creep into telegrams from London which do not come direct, but are passed on from one centre to another. Our present remarks must therefore be considered to apply only if the reports of Sir E. Grey's statements with regard to railways in Turkey and the customs increase.

Here follows part of the telegram in question.

We can accept the statement about the English being able to try to obtain other railway concessions, provided the meaning of the phrase is not stretched. Our country is not in a position to do so, and we are therefore pleased that English capitalists should seek to obtain railway concessions in Turkey; but if there is any possibility of stretching (the phrase) interference with the Baghdad-Basorah Railway negotiations, i.e., if there is any possibility of such other concessions) as compensation for the construction of the Baghdad-Basorah line, we say that Turkey cannot accept such a demand.



We find that the Ottoman Government has no doubt to the despair of the English that what gives him hope is that the Ottoman Government with regard to an increase in the customs dues. This means that the British pose some conditions on our rightful, lawful demand. Seeing that those who will pay the customs dues, and that not a penny of the pockets of foreigners on that account, we cannot think it quite right to raise difficulties over this increase which we need to ensure our equilibrium and to console our Government, or to act as though making demands on Turkey and to seek for compensation.

When we once proposed to England that the customs should be increased, the condition she laid down was that the increase in revenue be devoted to the construction of the Bagdad Railway. We can be built with the old customs revenue. Are we going to wait just when we thought we had a right to expect it?

It is railways which might damage the rights of British commerce, especially referring to the Lynch steamers. If the Bagdad-Basrah line is constructed, it will compete with the Lynch steamers, therefore let it not be built. That is the point of view of the English Minister for Foreign Affairs in its nakedness. This means that we make a mistake in ever allowing English capitalists to come to Iraq, for it means that we shall now have to suffer punishment for that permission being unable to build a railway we want. For us to be able to build a railway in a country—a question of life and death—they impose a condition on us and tell us to safeguard and assure England's commercial interests. With such better examples before us, how can we help being scared of foreign capital in general? For we see that a favour granted by us to-day in answer to a request and entreaty is used against us to-morrow as a weapon. Such an action may be a sign of strength, but it is proof of much more.

9419]

No. 161

Excerpt from the "Times" of March 14, 1911—(Received at Foreign Office, March 11.)

#### THE KILOMETRIC GUARANTEE

(To the Editor of the "Times")

Sir,

YOUR letter from your correspondent "Veritas" in to-day's issue raises an interesting question and one which is not unlikely to become urgent in the near future.

I differ profoundly from your correspondent in regard to much of his letter, but I agree at present to join issue with him upon one aspect of the question alone, his contention that while the construction amount may perhaps be excessive, the guaranteeing the line is arranged upon such a scale that any excess yielded by the first item is more than counterbalanced by the loss to the promoters involved in the second, with the net result that the railway becomes a direct source of profit to the Turkish Government.

Your correspondent admits that in regard to construction there will be a substantial balance on the right side—that is, in favour of the promoters: this substantial balance may be 1,000,000, 3,000,000, or even 5,000,000.

The Turkish Government have to recoup themselves for this substantial balance which is an adverse one from the point of view of the Turkish taxpayer—by the working expenses guarantee. What is this "working expenses guarantee"?

According to article 35 of the Bagdad Railway Convention of March, 1903, it is provided as follows—

Until the gross (not net) receipts per kilometre reached 4,500 fr. per annum, the difference between this sum and the actual gross receipts will be made up to the company by the Ottoman Government. When these receipts exceed the said 4,500 fr., but have not reached 10,000 fr., the entire surplus, over and above 4,500 fr., goes to

the Ottoman Government. When the gross kilometric receipts surpass 10,000 fr. the excess over this sum is to be divided between the Government and the company in the [unusual] proportion of 60 per cent. and 40 per cent.

Now, sir, in the Egyptian Delta Railways it is, I believe, found necessary to invert the last-named proportion, so that of the gross receipts only 40 per cent. accrues to the Government and 60 per cent. is left to the railway company. How, therefore

Bagdad Railway Company to work the line if such an unusual proportion is to be forfeited to the Turkish Government?

So long as the gross kilometric receipts are kept below possibility of loss to the company; it is therefore to the direct

the company to restrict receipts within that figure, in other words, the first aim of the company must be, from the point of view of its shareholders, to discourage traffic on the line, and, so long as this is successfully done, the profit of the Government from the undertaking is nil, while there is nothing to outweigh the

in the hands of the company after construction

the construction amount is more than sufficient, the working interest is arranged upon such a scale as to discourage traffic. Neither of it is apparently to the benefit of the Turkish taxpayer.

There seems to be a consensus of opinion that, as your correspondent points out, Turkey, in India, and in other undeveloped countries some sort of a guarantee is of railways. But there are forms of guarantee

progressively develop

Your correspondent

the advantages of substituting some such arrangement as obtains in India which places a premium on dubious methods. I cannot bring myself to shew appreciation of the intelligence of the Young Turks. I rather apprehend that the objection to a modification in the terms of the concession will emanate from the promoters of that enterprise, while there have been clear indications, not only in the Turkish press, but in the Chamber of Deputies, that opinion in Turkey is aware that all is not well under the terms of the concession of 1903.

I am, &c.

PROBITAS

March 13, 1911

8979

No. 162

Sir Edmund Grey to Sir G. Buchanan.

SECRET.

J. P.

Foreign Office, March 14, 1911.

telegrams No. 54 of the 10th March and No. 55 of the 11th March Khormabad line.

referred in your telegram No. 55 has my approval, but it might be more prudent to allude to our trade in Western rather than in Northern Persia in any conversations you may have with Minister for Foreign Affairs. Our trade via Bagdad and Khorasan, as you are no doubt aware, has recently risen to nearly 1,000,000, a-year, but it would be as well to avoid raising Russian susceptibilities unnecessarily. No allusion should be made to trans-Persian railway project.

M. Stolypin may be handed a memorandum as you propose, and he should be given to understand that at present we only wish to obtain an option to construct the line at Khar Mou, but that we consider it important to approach the Government without delay. You may add that we will discuss the subject very fully with the Russian Government before we exercise that option, and consider carefully how far British capital could be induced to invest in a Russian link-up line from Julia to point on proposed Mohammedan Khormabad line, and how best Russian trade interests can be safeguarded if scheme is realised.

[9842]

No. 163.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie

(No. 91.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 14, 1911

I TOLD M. Cambon to-day, confidentially, what were the Turkish proposals ... to the Baghdad Railway, pointing out that, in return for a 20 per cent participation in the section from Baghdad to the Gulf, we should hand over Koweit to the Turks. This, of course, was impossible. But we were having the proposals examined by the India Office and the Board of Trade, and I considered that we were only at the beginning of the negotiations.

M. Cambon might it was out of the question that we should accept the Turkish ... out this to Djavid Bey, of ... with ... certainly require a much larger ... In addition, we had ... which was ...

I ... and we should require that he should be secured in his *status quo*, in fact in home rule. M. Cambon told me that Djavid Bey was quite alive to the fact the

quite satisfactory with regard to the *status quo* and home rule for the Sheikh of Koweit, saying that the Turks would not disturb the Sheikh. But he had explained that the railway must end in an Ottoman port, because the company would be Ottoman and there would have to be Ottoman customs officials and police along the line. M. Cambon considered that all this pointed to

I thanked him for telling me what Djavid Bey had said, ... in conducting the negotiations. One essential point, which was ... that whatever arrangement was come to, the position of the Sheikh of Koweit must not be worse than at present. This was an obligation of honour for

I am, &c.  
E. GREY

[9841]

No. 164

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(No. 78.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 14, 1911

COUNT BENCKENDORFF reminded me to-day that the Russian Government had expressed sympathy with the Trans-Persian railway proposal, and had said that they could not express a more definite opinion before having a project put before them by a "Comité d'Etudes," and Count Benckendorff pressed me as to whether the British

I asked whether the "Comité d'Etudes" would expect a guarantee.

Count Benckendorff replied that the idea was that the Russian Government should receive them the profit on the transit through Russia of all goods for the Persian railway. This railway would bring increased traffic to the Russian lines in Russia, and the profit on this increase would amount to about 1,500,000 roubles a year. This was something to beg.

I observed that, since M. Sazonov had been so positive that no guarantee could be given by the Russian Government for any Persian railway, I had assumed that the project could not make much progress. But, nevertheless, we had lost no time in communicating with the Government of India. I would now look into what had passed, and let him have a reply.

He reminded me that the Emperor took great interest in the question

I am, &c.  
E. GREY

9842

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(No. 79.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 14, 1911.

COUNT BENCKENDORFF to-day, very confidentially, the same information as to the Baghdad Railway and Persian railways as I had just given to M. Cambon, which I have recorded in my despatch No. 89 to Sir F. Bertie

I am, &c.  
E. GREY

[9557]

No. 165

Extract from the "Morning Post" of March 15, 1911 - (Received at Foreign Office March 15)

#### RAILROAD RAILWAY QUESTION, FRENCH GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE

From a French Correspondent

THE attitude of the French Government towards the Baghdad Railway cannot be thoroughly understood without a short historical retrospect.

Up until the year 1902, French policy in respect of the Baghdad scheme was to connect Asia Minor with the Persian Gulf, which was the idea of Count Benckendorff in 1871, could not appeal to France since all the previous English or French schemes had always aimed at connecting the Persian Gulf and of Mesopotamia with the Mediterranean.

Owing to the importance of French settlements in the north-eastern Bagdad Railway recommended in 1902 would have suited France much better than the German scheme.

The French would, for strategic reasons, have preferred to connect Constantinople with the remotest parts of their Empire. Therefore the French Government never offered a blind opposition to the German scheme. Curiously enough, it was a French company, the Compagnie Pivon-Lille which constructed the first line from Haider Pacha to Mosul in 1871-73.

A new situation arose, however, when a German company secured in 1898 the concession from Ismail to Angora with the promise of an ulterior extension towards Bagdad. With a little more energy it was generally thought at the time that France could have secured the concession for herself. But now the Deutsche Bank had the money and meant business. In 1898 the German rails reached Angora, and the Anatolian company secured two more concessions—one from Angora to Kuesehir, which was built in 1900.

As to the route to be followed by the future line, the French line was thereby offered to French interests. First of all, the French line was shut out from any extension towards the east or the south. Such was the case with the line from Mulana to Brusa, and later on with the Smyrna-Kassala line, after the latter had been bought by French financiers from an English company. In the second place, the Bagdad line was to take the Syrian route instead of crossing the Kurdistan; it was bound to ignore the Mesopotamian route, worked by an Anglo-German line, which might prevent any further extension of the French lines in Syria.

Had England joined hands with France at that moment it might have been possible to interfere in an efficient way with the somewhat ambitious schemes of the Germans. Unfortunately, this was not the case. The French Ambassador in Constantinople (then M. Paul Cambon) had to act alone. He therefore confined himself to asking for compensation. Owing to his successful efforts France secured not only the line from Damascus to Aleppo, including any future line which might connect that with the coast, but also the line from the Damascus-Aleppo line as far north as Birejik. Had the French financiers taken advantage of that very concession they would have found themselves in an exceptionally strong position.

The French railway already in operation. It was not the French Ambassador's fault that



the construction of the Aleppo Birejik Railway was not pushed in time, and that the German company easily managed to take over that part of the concession in 1903.

It was only in 1902 that the policy of the French Government, in view of the imminent agreement between the Turks and the Anatolian company, over the Bagdad line, became definite. Nobody failed to perceive then that a misunderstanding had arisen between the French Foreign Office and the representatives of French interests in Constantinople. Since 1897, when an agreement had been arrived at between the Anatolian company and the French directors of the Smyrna Kasseba line (which had

had made up their mind to have a share in the Bagdad line), they had taken part in the Turco-German negotiations of 1899, and the Ottoman Bank was to keep for itself at first 40 per cent., ultimately 30 per cent., of the capital in the new enterprise. According to M. André Cheradame, the French Ambassador, M. Constant, had gone so far as to promise French participation in the Bagdad affair without consulting his colleagues in Paris. On the 24th March, 1902, M. Delcassé, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, declared, however, that French participation to the Bagdad Railway would only be possible if two conditions were fulfilled: (1) the Russians must be allowed to take part in the enterprise, (2) the French must have in the construction, the working and the direction of the enterprise "a part strictly equal to that of the most favoured foreign nation."

#### PARTICIPATION OF FRENCH FINANCE

There is, of course, no object in concealing the fact that a large majority did not follow M. Delcassé's lead. When the Bagdad Railway was constituted on the 5th March, 1903, French participation amounted to 30 per cent., although the Council of Administration contained 14 Germans as against 8 French, 2 Swiss, 1 Austrian, and 1 Italian. This is not all. The Bagdad company has always found a strong support amongst the Ottoman bankers, and the fact that the constitution of the Ottoman Debt in 1914 would have been a very liberal operation to perform had not M. Rouvier (who was Minister of Finance at the time) and is still the head of a large French bank) backed up the French position.

At the end of the year 1900 a syndicate had been formed in Constantinople for the purpose of constructing the section of the Bagdad line which extends from Bulgaria to El Heli. It has been promoted by the Ottoman Bank in order to give effect to its participation in the railway, and included four French members. Questioned in the French Chamber on the 27th December, M. Picton emphatically denied that the French Government had withdrawn its opposition to the scheme. Mentioned by his predecessor, M. Delcassé, he now added a third condition: England ought to be allowed to participate in the enterprise as well as Russia and France. On one hand, he said, "we have always held the view that, if a call were to be made upon the credit of the Empire, we ought, as far as possible, to act in the name of the Empire, and not of the French Republic."

M. Delcassé's explanation has been the subject of much discussion. It is to be noted that he has not failed to confer with the British, as well as with the Russian Government, on this question, and I have not failed to discuss it with the Germans when they met and the matter to me. In a word, we have not ceased to look for the possible settlement of this important question on an equitable co-operation on the part of the various States concerned in the enterprise, on the basis of a share for ourselves equal to that of the most favoured among the States." Lastly, M. Picton declared on the 16th January, 1904, that the Bagdad Railway Company, under M. Croppi, should take a different line, and be excluded from the Paris Bourse and all further notice.

It is that negative policy come to stay? Will M. Delcassé's declarations hold good for ever, or is there any prospect of a compromise which might put an end to the present deadlock? Had France only to consult her own interests there is not doubt that she would soon come back to her policy of the Bagdad Railway, looking simply for a proper compensation in some other part of Turkey. It is very difficult to see for what economic or political reasons the French Government

should in that case object to the quotation of the Bagdad Railway on the Paris Stock Exchange.

M. André Cheradame wrote seven or eight years ago that the Bagdad enterprise was bound to do much harm to French economic interests in Turkey. One cannot help thinking that he overstated his case. French interests in the Ottoman Empire are of course very considerable: according to M. Cheradame's estimate, French investments in Turkey amounted in 1902 to about 80,000,000l. A more recent estimate published in 1904 showed that those investments had gone up in six or seven years to near 100,000,000l. and British interests of about 30,000,000l. But out of those 100,000,000l., 60,000,000l. are invested in State funds; they are not likely to suffer from the construction of the Bagdad Railway any more than the 1,000,000l. invested in land and real property. 300,000l. invested in banks and credit institutes, or the 2,500,000l. invested in mines and industrial enterprises. As far as the railways are concerned (15,000,000l.) it is a well established fact that since the Bagdad company bought the Aleppo Birejik line in 1903 and the Mersin Adana line in 1906, it is not likely to interfere with the important French lines which are all located in Syria. The Bagdad interests may, as a result of the new enterprise, follow in the extension which would endanger the prosperity of some French companies.

It is to change their antiquated policy, it is equally difficult to justify a policy of French participation in the Bagdad Railway.

It seems rather unlikely that the Bagdad Railway, as far as the general management is concerned, which is in the hands of the Ottoman Bank, has undertaken not to bring a single German colonist to Turkey, which depends upon the good will of the Turks as well as upon non-German investors, will do much more for Germany than other lines have done for France or England. At any rate, France has very few political interests outside Syria, and cannot be very much afraid of a line which is only touching Syria's borders. As for the constitution of the company, it has nothing in itself which should prevent the admission of the Bagdad Railway on the Paris Bourse: there are indeed a great number of companies which have free access to the Paris market, in spite of the fact that their French shareholders are not properly represented on the board of directors.

#### INTERNATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The French Government has, therefore, no vital reason, so far as France herself is concerned, to insist on the conditions laid down by M. Delcassé. But other considerations of an equally imperative nature are preventing the French Foreign Office from settling at once its differences with the Bagdad Railway Company. It is almost an open secret that M. Delcassé took up the position of 1902 in order to please Russia, who strongly objected to the building of the new line. Curiously enough the Russian Press had started a campaign against French participation in the scheme in January, 1902, two months before the famous declaration made in the French Parliament. The article written by M. Proudhon, went as far as to hint that the Franco-Russian Alliance largely depended upon the attitude of France towards the Bagdad Railway. It is to be noted that the Russian Press interfered in the same way in 1903, when Russia's side in a question which was for her of a greater interest than to France.

Recent Russian action, of course, inclined to take another view of the Bagdad Railway. But even if she comes to oppose the scheme France is not prepared to follow her. It is to be noted that she can do so without hurting English interests. An important feature of the present situation, and it would be a great pity if English opinion were not aware that to-day French policy is entirely directed in the Bagdad question by the Anglo-French understanding. It is, of course, a sad fact that up to now the co-operation of French and English private interests in Constantinople has been very imperfect. On the British side the complaint has justly been made that French financiers have too often chosen to increase their personal profits by joining hands with England's opponents. French financiers retort that the representatives of British interests have several times acted against France; for instance, when the British Government instituted against the Société des Chemins de Fer de Bagdad a campaign which tried to secure the concession of the Bagdad Railway to the British.

Tripoli line, which had already been promised to France. The last Turkish loan was, when the Ottoman Bank and the National Bank stood 1.

people say that in Constantinople the *entente cordiale* was nothing but a name. But between a few individuals' interests—there are indeed a

the policy of both Governments. When M. P. . . . Parliament a month ago that the *entente* between the . . . . . Office had never been stronger, his declarations, I . . . . . precisely meaning. Exactly as England's diplomacy supported France . . . . . affair so the French Government has promised not to settle the

not as England's interests are much more vitally concerned with the Bagdad question . . . . . Then

since the solution of the Bagdad question is to be a . . . . .

British Ambassador in Constantinople suggest that that English solution may be . . . . . in the very near future. As in 1909, when on England's advice the French Foreign Office asked from the Turks the concession of a line from Haifa to Bagdad, conversations of an analogous kind are just taking place between the French and the Turkish Governments. It is too soon to make a forecast of what will be the Anglo-Turkish . . . . . and regarding Mesopotamia and Koweit or to say whether the French Foreign Office will look for compensation in Armenia, in North Anatolia, or anywhere else . . . . . Owing, however, to already certain. Whatever the future may have in store the French Government will look at the Bagdad question from a British as well as from a French point of view and support British claims in Mesopotamia . . . . . diplomacy but what is perhaps more efficient in the present case, with the virtual power at its disposal.

9590

No. 167

Sir E. Goschen to Sir Edward Grey. (Received March 16.)

No. 167)

With reference to my despatch No. 65 of the 10th March, 1911, relating to the Bagdad Railway question, I have the honour to report that the *Adlon-Zeitung*, after referring in appreciative to recent statement in the House of Commons goes on to make the following observations with regard to Koweit and to the proposed 4 per cent. increase in the Turkish customs:

"Quite apart from the question of the proposed increase of Turkish customs dues, and the possible appearance of a surplus yield of duties to a kilometre guaranteed on the Bagdad Railway. Nevertheless, we believe that in this question too, it will be possible to arrive at an understanding which will satisfy the wishes of Turkey and also account English interests. In the concluding part of his speech, Sir Edward Grey reviewed the much discussed question of the relation of Koweit on the Persian Gulf to the Ottoman Empire. This is a matter which demands in the first place discussion with Turkey on questions of international law. We therefore prefer not to examine this point too closely, especially as it is not necessarily bound up with the question of the construction of the line down to the shores of the Gulf."

The "Norddeutsche" remarks in conclusion that your statement on the Bagdad Railway question signals a great advance on previous British methods, which had not always been free from a certain flavour of chicanery in the matter of this particular Ottoman enterprise, "which was destined to strengthen Turkey not only politically, but also commercially, and thereby benefit the whole civilized world."

I have, &amp;c.

W. E. GOSCHEN

[7880]

No. 168

Foreign Office to India Office.

(Secret and Immediate)

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 14

I AM directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant, containing the detailed observations of the Secretary of State for India on the Viceroy's telegram of the 23rd February respecting the position at Koweit, and I am further to acknowledge the receipt of copies of two telegrams dated the 7th March, from the Viceroy on the subject of railway projects in Mesopotamia and south-west Persia.

With regard to a proposal for modification of the *status* of Koweit, I am to inform you that Sir E. Grey is in substantial agreement with the views of the . . . . . stated in your letter of the 3rd March, with the exception of the . . . . . which contemplates, viz., that 75 per cent. of capital and control in the Bagdad Koweit section of the Bagdad Railway would be inadequate as a share for this country.

With regard to this suggestion, I am to point out that on the 1st May, 1911, Sir E. Grey wrote a letter to Sir H. Lubbock-Smith, in which the following passage

I think that the British share should be 55 per cent., and that we should construct the harbour at Koweit and have a large share.

A copy of this letter was enclosed in the memorandum handed to the Ottoman Minister of Finance on the 29th July 1910, and, in the same memorandum, certain

Sir E. Grey is of opinion that they have already stated to the Ottoman Government, and that capital and control would be the *maximum* share which they could now . . . . . on were one of internationalisation under the concession of 1903.

the terms of the written proposals of the Turkish Government, enclosed in Sir G. Lowther's despatch No. 139 of the 1st March (of which a copy is transmitted herewith), it would appear that what is contemplated by the Sultan's Porte is that the 1903 concession, in so far as it applies to the sections in question, should be cancelled and that another arrangement should be substituted. It is of course, clear that the consideration of these proposals must be largely dependent upon whether or not they have the concurrence of the German Government and, both from the failure of Sir G. Lowther to elicit any precise and definite information on the point, and from reports which have appeared in the German press, it would seem that such is not indeed the case. Be this as it may, Sir E. Grey is of opinion that the attitude of His Majesty's Government in regard to the proposals now made should be . . . . .ly considered in all its bearings, with a view to sending a reasoned reply to the . . . . . Government without undue delay.

It is therefore essential to enquire whether, in the interests of British trade or on other grounds, a preponderating share of capital and control is a condition  *sine qua non* of British participation in the enterprise. If a settlement on the lines desired should prove attainable in regard to Koweit, and if the 1903 concession is to be cancelled in so far as concerns the railway beyond Bagdad, and a formal international agreement substituted (such agreement stipulating, *inter alia*, that differential tariffs are absolutely excluded, and that the whole management of the line shall be conducted on appropriate methods), is it indispensable that British control, either in share-capital or Board, should be preponderating? Is it not possible that . . . . . as concerns equality of treatment for British merchandise, could be . . . . . by stipulating in the contemplated international agreement or bi-lateral contract that British assent to the desired increase in the customs is conditional upon the continued fulfilment of certain obligations by Turkey, and that default on her part would, *ipso facto*, determine the period of British assent to the enhanced custom tariff? Even if His Majesty's Government were to hesitate to exercise such a power, the knowledge that they possessed it would undoubtedly exercise a salutary effect, on the analogy of the 3 per cent. customs increase, agreed to for seven years in 1903.

It is provided that the 4 per cent. increase should be levied for only a fixed . . . . . for a further period would depend upon whether or not the Ottoman Government had fulfilled all obligations as to the exclusion of manipulation of rates.



If it is considered desirable that agreement should be reached as to British participation in the enterprise, it is important not to forego such participation on adequate grounds. Sir E. Grey does not desire to express a final opinion on expediency of such participation until he has been further acquainted with the views of the Secretary of State for India and of the Board of Trade.

But, in the meantime, I am to place before you certain considerations for and against British participation in a degree which is not pre-assumption to both contingencies being that satisfaction indicated, can be reached in regard to the views of His Majesty's Government.

It may be urged that, in the absence of a definite agreement, conflicting interests of different nationalities in the Mesopotamian delta are likely to become more and more acute as time goes on, that French financial interests are likely to be prejudiced at the prospect of French participation in the enterprise being postponed indefinitely, that in any case the Bagdad Railway will ultimately be completed; that the position of the Central Government in Turkey will then be consolidated and the Turkish power of aggression against Kuwait correspondingly increased, that the Turkish Government are not now consulted, the fulfilment of British treaty obligations towards the Sheikh of Kuwait will become more onerous and difficult, while the protection of the Sheikh's date plantations in Turkish territory, whence he derives his principal revenue, will be a source of increasing friction and annoyance; and that British prestige would suffer, to the detriment of British commercial interests, if Great Britain had no share in the construction of the sections of the railway between Bagdad and the Persian Gulf.

On the other hand, it may be urged that it is perhaps to the advantage of British interests that the advent of the railway towards the Gulf should be postponed as long as possible, that the progress of the railway has hitherto been slow, and that time may elapse before it reaches completion, that without the additional British co-operation in these half-civilised regions the bonds of the railway company are not likely to find a ready market in the future any more than is believed to have been the case in the past, that, without British participation, the railway would probably stop at Basorah, thus eliminating questions of some complexity as to junction and similar matters which might arise if the terminus were at Kuwait, and would almost be necessary to institute a British

that, apart altogether from an arrangement to secure British participation in the railway, the differences with Turkey in regard to Kuwait and the littoral of the Persian Gulf might be adjusted as a condition of British assent to the customs increase the continuance of the 3 per cent. increase on its expiry in April 1914, that regard to the general nature of British rights under the Capitulations, that the Government could not improbably prevent the manipulation of tariff rates as against British trade, though this is a technical matter as to which the advice of the Board of Trade is being requested, and that the large volume of British trade (estimated at nearly one million sterling a year) which now passes into western Persia by way of Bagdad, might be diverted to a less circuitous route, and thereby be protected against adverse treatment, if a concession were obtained for a railway from Khor Musa and Mohammerah to Khorramshahr.

Sir E. Grey feels that the question of British participation in the Gulf sections of the Bagdad Railway without control is one which must be judged on its merits and apart from the general effect of non-participation on the international situation. If it were decided that, on the whole, it was not worth the while of His Majesty's Government to encourage British capital to participate in the railway without control, but that British opposition to the enterprise would be withdrawn when a satisfactory arrangement had been concluded as to questions at issue between Great Britain and Turkey in the littoral of the Persian Gulf, no foreign country would then have cause of complaint in regard to the British attitude.

If, on the other hand, it is considered desirable that Great Britain should participate, it will be necessary to decide whether it would be to their advantage to obtain a large or a small share in the undertaking, what steps should be taken to secure the retention of this share in British hands, and whether a Representative of His Majesty's Government should have a seat on the Board.

Sir E. Grey would be glad to have the views of the Secretary of State for India on these points.

The question of the kilometre guarantee is not alluded to in this letter, as it can well be reserved for subsequent consideration.

I am to express Sir E. Grey's full concurrence in the importance of avoiding any admissions with regard to the status of Kuwait that may be used to our detriment should the present negotiations with Turkey prove abortive; and, for this reason, he is anxious that the reply to the Turkish proposals should be drawn up in close consultation with your Department.

Before leaving the subject of Kuwait, I am to advert to the view expressed by the Marquess of Lansdowne, in his memorandum of the 21st March, 1902, that the British position to protect could not be interpreted as extending beyond Kuwait "proper."

claims to Warba and Hubriya might be upheld if it is really desirable to do so, he thinks that those claims could hardly be sustained with regard to Um Kasr, and

Koweit proper (Bander Schewakh) the importance of Warba, Hubriya and Um Kasr is largely reduced. In any case, if an agreement with Turkey is reached, it will be desirable to define precisely the limits of Kuwait territory in order to avoid future friction, and I am to suggest that, with a view to expedition, it might be desirable for the Government of India to be consulted by telegraph in regard to those limits.

With a reference to the concluding paragraph of your letter, I am to draw your attention to the fact that the Government of India are to define the position of the Powers in the Gulf, and that the position is clearly satisfactory.

Finally I am to express Sir E. Grey's opinion that it is extremely desirable, if only for tactical reasons, to obtain a concession for a line from Khor Musa and Mohammerah to Khorramshahr, especially as the concession need not involve more than an option to construct.

I am, &c.  
LOUIS MALLETT

7880)

No. 169

Foreign Office to Board of Trade

I AM directed by Secretary Sir Edward Grey to transmit to you, to be laid before the Board of Trade, the accompanying copies of correspondence between the Board of Trade and the India Office on the subject of railway construction in Mesopotamia, in South West Persia.

Copies of the papers referred to in that correspondence are enclosed herewith.

Sir Edward Grey would be glad to be furnished with the detailed observations of the Board of Trade in regard to the points raised in this correspondence in so far as they affect British trade, in particular he would like information as to whether British-Indian trade would be adversely affected by the imposition of lighter transit charges towards the Persian Gulf than on goods going in the opposite direction.

I am to draw the special attention of the Board to the fact that it is important to consider what steps could be taken to protect British trade in their operation upon British trade.

It is important to consider what steps could be taken to protect British trade in their operation upon British trade.

location were arranged for the Gulf sections of the railway, and to allow a proportionate control in capital and

from this department to the India Office, and before forming a final opinion on the matter, Sir Edward Grey would be glad of the technical and detailed advice of the Board of Trade. He would also welcome any further criticism on the proposals now made by the Turkish Government (see Sir G. Lowther's despatch No. 131 of the 1st March).

I am, &c.  
W. LANGLEY

[9732]

No. 170

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 17)

(No. 156.)

Sir,

Constantinople, March 10, 1911.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the translation of a speech delivered the 5th instant in reply to the criticisms of Ismail Kemal Bey by the Grand Vizier the subject of the liabilities of the Ottoman Government towards the Bagdad Railway Company.

You will observe that his Highness stated that, apart from the convention the company had a claim upon the excess revenues of the customs under the firman granting the concession, but that when the 3 per cent increase was obtained, the company abandoned that claim. Now, when there was a question of obtaining a rate of 4 per cent the same question presented itself.

Before transmitting to you the text of the speech, I thought it well to ask his Highness whether he had been properly reported, and invited him to inform me which was the firman that granted those revenues as guarantees.

At first his Highness was disposed to say that he could not carry the complicated tale of the liabilities of the Ottoman Government in his head, but, after a pressure on my part, he stated that it was not a firman, but the convention of 1868 not made as a guarantee the excess revenues of the debt. I said I could not accept that interpretation, and then read him the article of the convention, showing him the

where only we

declined to accept this view, and insisted that

the word "entire" meant the whole railway

I insert here the paragraph referred to

, relating to the convention of 20 February, 1868

the Imperial has decided to prolong the line of Bagdad depuis Houtgourlou jusqu'à la localité dite Hefif, située aux abords de Mossoul, et de construire un embranchement de Tel Hahesch à Alep. La longueur de cette ligne et de l'embranchement est d'environ 840 k.

L'excédent des revenus concédés à la Dette publique ayant été affecté au prolongement de la ligne de Bagdad, la garantie pour ces 840 kilom. de ligne sera payée sur les excédents des revenus concédés à la Dette publique à raison de 11,000 fr. par kilomètre, en conformité de l'article 35 de la Convention de Bagdad.

His Highness was quite unable to move his Highness on this point, although I

year (as reported in my despatch No. 276, Secret, of the

May) the point of view of the Ottoman Government was that they were only bound by a moral and not a legal obligation to the continuation of the line. Hakkı Pasha was quite unable to explain how, if he relied on the 1868 convention, it had

stated in his speech, been necessary to obtain from the railway an abandonment of their claim to the 3 per cent. surtax. The answer may, however, be explained by the enclosure in this embassy's despatch No. 18 of the 5th February, 1902. Finally, his Highness said that the argument was not an important one, as there was no question of the 4 per cent surtax being required for the construction of the Haid Bagdad section. This, of course, is true, but only because Turkey is providing for ordinary expenses out of her own resources.

I then explained to his Highness again at length that our consent to the increase of the 4 per cent was dependent not only on the abandonment of the claim of the 1 per cent by the Bagdad Railway, but to a general settlement of the railway question, which would not interfere with our existing rights in those regions, and, I added, that to avoid any misunderstanding I would place our views upon paper for His Highness's consideration.

I have &c.

GEORGE LOWTHER

Enclosure in No. 170.

Extract from the "Turques" of March 6, 1911

## LES DÉCLARATIONS DU GRAND VIZIR

YAKI PACHA montant à la tribune, fait d'abord observer qu'il ne croit pas que le chemin de fer de Bagdad ait été construit en trente ans. "Ismail Kemal Bey dit qu'un concessionnaire avait demandé à construire le Chemin de Fer de Bagdad sans garantie kilométrique et qu'Abdul Hamid n'a pas accepté avant préférer accorder la concession aux Allemands. Cela, assurément, est faux."

Le Grand Vizir parle longuement des profits que retirent les pays les chemins de fer. "Le chemin de fer de Bagdad est une garantie kilométrique et le Chemin de Fer de Bagdad."

Le Grand Vizir parle longuement des profits que retirent les pays les chemins de fer. "Le chemin de fer de Bagdad est une garantie kilométrique et le Chemin de Fer de Bagdad." "L'argent, peut-être," dit-il, "mais je ne vois aucune condition comme nuisible. L'argent de doter le pays d'une voie ferrée. "Cela," dit-il, "ne signifie pas qu'il y ait à toutes les exigences des concessions, mais je puis assurer que notre pays n'a pas subi des pertes du fait des garanties kilométriques."

"Il y a quelque chose de plus, c'est la famine en Anatolie."

Pendant les deux années suivantes les envois de céréales continuent. Mais en 1908 l'exportation a commencé, et dans un an une somme de 4,000,000 de livres est entrée au vilayet d'Angora pour les marchandises exportées. En général, personne ne peut pas nier que les chemins de fer et les moyens de communication en général contribuent à l'augmentation des recettes de l'Etat. Sous le règne d'Abdul Aziz cet Empire était si étendu. Mais aujourd'hui, après la perte de la Bulgarie, de la Roumanie orientale, de la Bosnie et de l'Herzégovine, les recettes de l'Etat sont supérieures de 5 p. 100 à ce qu'elles étaient sous le règne d'Abdul Aziz.

## LE CHEMIN DE FER DE BAGDAD

Le Grand Vizir dit qu'il ne croit pas que le chemin de fer de Bagdad ait été construit en trente ans. "L'excédent des revenus concédés à la Dette publique ayant été affecté au prolongement de la ligne de Bagdad, la garantie pour ces 840 kilom. de ligne sera payée sur les excédents des revenus concédés à la Dette publique à raison de 11,000 fr. par kilomètre, en conformité de l'article 35 de la Convention de Bagdad."

et c'est pour cette raison que l'augmentation n'a pu encore aboutir. "Si l'on nous concède le 4 pour cent, la Compagnie du Chemin de Fer de Bagdad a le droit de demander que l'excédent des recettes soit affecté au prolongement de la ligne. Réglez la convention."

Ismail Kemal Bey. "Construisons une nouvelle"

Le Grand Vizir. "Si nous déclarons les conventions existantes, je"

nous respectons les conventions existantes. L'Etat ne peut pas se désolidariser de ses engagements. L'excédent des recettes, nous le consacrerons à la construction de la ligne. D'ailleurs, comment nous pourrions dire à la société que nous ne voulons pas de l'excédent des recettes? Cela équivaudrait à la résiliation d'un accord existant."

En outre, je ne comprends pas la raison d'arrêter la voie ferrée à Haid et de ne pas aller la capitale avec la ville de Bagdad. Est-ce pour ne pas payer annuellement la somme insignifiante de 250,000 francs qu'on n'en veut pas, quand il s'agit du chemin de fer de Bagdad, qui nourrit le royaume des Abbassides et la Mésopotamie, qui nourrit le monde?"

construction, et il reste, par Bagdad, 600 kilom. Mais, j'insiste pour la prolongation et je crois que la Chambre m'approuvera. ("Oui.")

Ismail Kemal Bey. "Et au delà de Bagdad, que ferez-vous?"

Hakkı Pacha. "Si le Cabinet ne trouve pas une combinaison profitable à l'Etat, il n'acceptera pas la prolongation au delà de Bagdad. Vous verrez que nous ne voulons tromper personne, et nous n'avons aucun autre but que l'ottomanisme, et je suis sûr qu'une entente est possible. (Approuvements prolongés.)"



[9875]

W. W. Timirasoff and Zuevintzov to Mr. Jackson.— (Communicated by Mr. March 17.)

Dear Sir,

March 19, 1911

THE last time we were in London at our meeting with you on the 2nd December

we saw the railway up to time, when, after we had positive indications that both Governments, as well as that of India, were not hostile to the project, a new meeting would be found opportune.

In pursuance of that object the Russian consortium, parallel to studying the detail of the project, was engaged in the study of the attitude towards the project.

At present we are able to inform you of the official answer of our Government.

Two weeks ago, our chairman, Engineer Runge, received the document signed by the clerk of the Cabinet, but very much later.

That gentleman, as the Clerk of the Cabinet,

as to the details they will have to be decided after all have submitted the

rules which tried to would oblige the Russian

received in Moscow. For instance, M. Gouletcoff, the Lord Mayor of Moscow

the President of the Board of the purpose of investigating to what extent the Russian commercial interests might be impaired by the construction of railways in

and the results were reported to the Cabinet by M. Tim

The Cabinet, after mature deliberation of this report, pronounced itself, as above mentioned, favourable to the project.

It is perfectly evident that in its official answer, addressed to the promoters of the enterprise, the Cabinet could not give more substantial promises, and had to put back all details to the time when a Société d'Etudes would be able to submit a scheme based on sound bases. But in conversations with Messrs. Runge and Petelcovsky, Minister of Finance admitted that he saw no drawbacks to allocating the surplus of

the railway system to and from India to a special fund that might serve as a guarantee to the debentures of the new line.

You would most kindly oblige us by forwarding information as to how the project

of information.

I believe us, &c.

[9729]

No. 172

Sir V. Cornhill to Sir Richard Grey.— (Received March 17)

(No. 211)

Sir,

March, 17, 1911

WHEN the first reports of your speech in Parliament on the Bagdad Railway question were received in Germany, it was generally hailed by the press

245

"Zeitung" reservation, he greeted as highly gratifying was quoted with approval in most of the South German papers.

Since then your treatment of the question of the Turkish tariff and relations to Koweit, and the leading article in the "Times" on the latter subject, have made the subject of more critical commentary. Most of the papers here only from the Berlin press generally arguing that Koweit is Turkish territory and that our rights there are in the nature only of claims and not established. But the "Frankfurter Zeitung" devotes a good deal of space to the subject which it discusses on its own account.

In its issue of the 10th instant, after praising your treatment of the relations of the Bagdad Company by putting them on the solid basis of existing facts, the writer goes on to say that as regards the tariff it may be supposed that the British Government did not propose to put pressure on Turkey in the matter of the railway, but rather that they would not withhold their consent to the raising of a tariff as soon as they were convinced that the extra revenues would not be used for their railway construction. There were hopes that you would soon receive the desired assurance. The Turkish Minister of Finance had explained in his budget that he was negotiating with the Bagdad Railway Company about the line of the understanding that the revenues produced by the

The writer thought himself safe in saying that the company of the Government in this respect, and that in this case you would keep and no longer withhold from Turkey a financial resource so necessary to her if she was to succeed in her difficult task. There was a certain obscurity, he adds, due perhaps to the deficiencies of the telegraphic message, in the report of the last part of your speech, you spoke of the possibility of the line passing out of Turkish territory.

the status quo which had been endangered by others. But it was difficult to understand what you had meant by your allusions to the obligations of England to the Sheikh of Koweit. England and Turkey held different views on the position of Koweit, and it was natural for an English Foreign Minister to support the views of his countrymen. A compromise between the two Powers was presumably possible, particularly seeing that you had not identified yourself with the theory, so often repeated by the English press, that Koweit was an English protectorate. If England had really only the desire to fulfil certain obligations towards the Sheikh, a way out of the difficulty might be found which would not violate the Turkish rights of sovereignty.

If the Bagdad Railway was concerned, it might be observed that the name of the company was entitled to occur in the concession. The company was entitled to the line from Zohar in the neighbourhood of Haifa to some point on the P. The line to be decided on between the Imperial Government and the holders of the concession. In the harbour of Koweit, however many advantages it might have, was not

I have, &c.  
VINCENT CORBETT

9999

No. 173

Sir G. Loecherer to Sir Richard Grey.— (Received March 18)

(No. 22)

(Telegraphic) P

BAGDAD Railway

Constantinople, March 18, 1911

My despatch No. 100 of the 14th February, the Minister for Foreign Affairs used me that the Turkish Government were on the point of signing the completion of the Halif Bagdad section on the following lines, having come to terms with the Bagdad Railway Company.

The company abandons right to build Bagdad to Persian Gulf section with proviso that a foreign Power shall have a larger share than Germany in the company to be formed for its construction.

The company to construct port at Alexandria and build branch line to Osmarich without kilometre guarantee. Company abandons all claims to proceeds of 4 per cent. of the surplus of revenues now assigned for the sections up to Halif to suffice for the section to Bagdad (see my despatch No. 134 of the 26th February).

2 P

9964

## RUSSIAN railways

Y. I. Yegorin, No. 87 of the 14th March. I had a conversation to-day with M. Stolygin, and left with him a memorandum on the subject of the Mohammedan Khorezmshah railway project. I had already discussed the question a few days ago with the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, who had prepared M. Stolygin for what I had to say.

M. Stolyun began by saying that Russia had no legal grounds for protesting against the scheme, since the proposed line would run through the neutral zone, but nevertheless, the scheme was one to which she strongly objected. A protest would be lodged by the Russian Government at Moscow, who would attack the Government for bringing it right up to the Russian sphere by rail, a action in constructing this line was an ill-considered one expected from a

I replied by reminding M. Stolypin that we did not like the Bagdad Railway with the North Persian railway system, and yet, when M. Stolypin had explained to us the reasons which rendered Russia's consent to it.

trusted that Russia would now show no less regard for our interests. The state of public feeling in England with regard to these railways had been manifested in the recent debate in the House of Commons on the subject, and if we were to be able to compete with Germany on equal terms the construction of the line now under consideration was essential to us. If this line were not constructed, Germany would be in a position to differentiate against British goods on both the Bagdad and Khankais lines. It was possible that Russia should contemplate shutting out British trade from Persia, while she was opening that region to the Germans.

My view of my arguments was admitted by M Stolypin, but at the same time they were obviously preoccupied by anticipations of the opposition which the realisation of the Medunnersk-Khoroshat scheme is likely to arouse in Russia. He asked me whether the British goods imported into Persia were of the same nature as those imported from Russia. I repeated my former statement, that our only desire at present was to obtain an option for the construction of this railway, and that, before proceeding with the actual work, we would thoroughly discuss all questions of the kind presented with the Russian Government. M Stolypin then said that he had spoken to M. Sazonow, but that he hoped that

May the latter would be well enough to proceed to El gland  
 Egypt to consent to our asking the Porcian Government at once for  
 a, while postponing discussion of the details of the scheme till M. Sazonov  
 was well enough to do business with us or to proceed to London to talk the  
 with you there

In conclusion, M. Stolypin said that he would discuss the question with the Minister of Commerce, and hoped in about a week to be able to let me know the result.

Sir G. Louthan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 20.)

*Penn. March 11, 1914*

Sir, WITH reference to my despatch No. 164 of the 10th instant, I have the honour to

GERARD LOWTHER

*Excerpt from the "Tatun" of March 11, 1911*

37

14-3 NINE-STAR SYSTEM

It seems likely that the article in which the semi-official German paper, the *Nachrichtliche Allgemeine Zeitung*, says that, as Turkey and the Baghdad Railway Company, one of the parties, can discuss the subject with a third party on its own initiative, will give rise to discussion, and the "Times" article which we reproduce to-day may be taken as the preliminary.

It is natural that the Ottomans, as the most interested party, should watch this discussion with great attention. We admit that it is rather strange that a matter affecting our country should be the subject of discussion and dispute between two foreign Governments. Yet we must be thankful for the blessings conferred on us by the international system, which enables us to interfere as much as we do in the affairs of other nations. Turkey's very life, would have been arranged without our knowledge, and doubtless to our disadvantage. The existence of an Ottoman Government conscious of its interests and rights and resolved to defend them naturally drew the discussion into another channel.

It was never by a cause of satisfaction to us that the Bagdad Railway question was a cause of satisfaction to us. We have always been in the position of a mediator between two opposing interests in the Persian Gulf, and that is why we maintained that we ought to come to an understanding with England and considered this discussion to be advantageous.

It is satisfactory to the statesmen of neither country, we believe, that the Persian Gulf question which is opposed to the friendly relations existing between England and Turkey should always exist as a vague and unexplained matter. Why should we not refer to a number of embarrassing questions come up. Why should we not remove them? When we hear England talk about English commercial interests and rights in the Persian Gulf we are naturally displeased and anxious, not knowing clearly what the material and real form of these interests is or will be. It was clearly necessary an exchange of views in order to avoid even greater misunderstandings.

an exchange of views in order to avoid even greater misunderstandings.

... and Turkey to discuss  
... way or the Persian Gulf.

the German paper is:  
an agreement, the condi-



of the 4 per cent., expressed the desire, in the interests of the internal  
of Egypt, that the Ottoman Government should arrange to remove the  
on the borrowing powers of the Government of His Highness the Khedive  
imposed by the Imperial decree of the 7th January (1879) (14th Ch. Jan. 1296) and thus  
return to the financial status quo ante of Egypt as indicated by the Imperial  
of the 8th June, 1873 (131)

10316

Sir G. Louchter to Sir Edmund Grey. Received March 20)

Page No. of 13 1911

No. 170

Mr C. Louth to Sir Edward Grey. - (Received March 29.)

Here, March 13, 1911

Peru, March 13 1911

With reference to your telegram No. 63 of the 11th instant and correspondence on the subject of the English Railway and  
transmit to you herewith copy of the "notice" which I have communicated  
Sublime Porte relative to the attitude of His Majesty's Government with re-  
spect to the proposed extension of the customs duties.

Insert A

(1)  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{A}_2$  are  $\mathcal{A}_1$ -independent.

118. **Bahadur Shah** His Majesty  
Government the by his Ex-  
Minister for Foreign Aff. A. M. A. Khan  
regarding the completion of the Baghdad-Basrah (and) Railway. Those proposals will  
receive the careful consideration of His Majesty's Government, and a reply will be sent  
in due course.

In the meantime, His Majesty's Embassy desires, under instructions from the Government, to draw all attention to the fact that paragraph 2 of the memorandum refers to the increase of the customs duties by 4 per cent, given which deals with one of the conditions of the amount of His Majesty's 4. laid down by His Majesty's Government which does not correspond with those which were at various times being explained to the Sultana Porte.

The point of view always maintained by His Majesty's Government has been that it would be unable to consent to the proposed increase for a fixed period if such sums were to be devoted, by setting free other affected revenues, to facilitating the introduction of a railway. It is, however, not less true that the Government have established British commercial interests in Mesopotamia.

These views were clearly set forth in a conversation which his Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs had with His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on 14th and 15th May 1906, and on the 26th day they were explained at the Foreign Office to his Highness the Ottoman Ambassador in London who was on that occasion accompanied by his Excellency the Minister of Finance.

Subsequently these views were set forth at greater length in a paper which was placed in the hands of his Excellency the Minister of Finance in London.

The course of the portraiture is

"WITH reference to my despatch No. 151 of the 10th instant, I have the honour to  
 enclose herewith a translation of an article by Hassan Djabal in the 'Tamm'

Magical Highway

no writer was that?

Times "on the left"

hold the line away and to carry the line to the shore of Persian Gulf. If England raises difficulties against the construction of the line at Kuwait, that will not prevent the construction of the line.

"Then," he goes on to say, "let us think that the invitation to England to enter into this was dictated by fear or necessity. This is far from being the case. Turkey will expect some return for the courtesy and friendship shown to England. But if Turkish friendship is rejected then Turkey need no longer consider British commercial interests. In any case, it cannot be believed that England will be guilty of such injustice, in a country where the 'Times,' as to whether or not she consent to the increase of the customs duties on the English Railway."

It comes to me that I am not alone in this. I am a man Socialist student of economy, which contends that the increase of the one duty to 15 per cent. *ad valorem* will be an economic blunder on the part of Turkey. There is no doubt that there is considerable logic in this point of view, as an increase of the customs duty to 15 per cent. on such primary production as, e.g., sugar, will constitute an all but unbearable burden on the lower classes, who are already living on very low

I have, &c.

## OF HARD LOWTHER

the "Tanner" of March 14, 1911

WE are always talking about this question, but we consider it our duty at the moment to inform our readers, to follow every phase of the question, on account of its bearing not only on our domestic but on our foreign policy.

Our prophecy that the Baghdad Railway question would give rise to a dispute between the German and British press has not been falsified. The "Times" article induces to-day to written with the next ray, the bitterness caused by the dispute. Let the English papers in the morning press quit us in our way, but it should not be forgotten when the English press is replying to the German papers, which are walking hand in hand with Otto, that the contents for the Ottoman Government and indifference to the Baghdad question will cause sorrow and astonishment in Turkey.

It is not our fault that the German papers have said that England can take part in the fight. ~~It is our fault~~ It is our fault that we have allowed the English press to wound to our nation's proper, our rights, and our feelings? The English and French or any other press must understand that we are not to be deceived.







## Foreign Office to India Office

Foreign Office, March 20, 1911

WITH reference to the letter of the 29th September, 1910, from this Office, relative to the proposed construction, under Anglo-Russian auspices, of a railway connecting Europe with India by way of Persia, I am directed to transmit to you herewith copy of a letter addressed to the Russian group interested in the project to Mr. Hugh Jackson, communicated to this Office.

This letter sets forth the attitude

of the British Government with the views of Viscount Morley, and of the Government of India, on the subject in order that he may be enabled to reply to Mr. Jackson without undue delay.

I am to add an expression of Sir E. Grey's hope that it may be found possible for His Majesty's Government to express themselves as favourable towards the project.

I am, Sir,  
LOUIS MAULET.

[10411]

No. 181

Enclosures in India Office Letter — (Received at Foreign Office, March 21)

Enclosure 1

Lieutenant-Colonel Cox to Government of India

I HAVE the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copies of correspondence which has passed between the political agent Koweit and the Sheikh of Koweit.

On the 1st inst. I received from the Sheikh of Koweit a letter in which he informed me that he had received from the Vali of Bassorah a letter in which the Vali had offered himself as a mediator between the Sheikh of Koweit and the Sheikh of Basra.

The latter purports to contain a history of the quarrel, and though correct in the main, is to some extent coloured, as might be expected in an account given by one of the parties.

After the dispatch of his reply the Sheikh received further news of Saadoon's advance with a large force to within striking distance of Jahara, and he then dispatched his telegram to the Vali, of which also I have the honour to enclose a copy.

It will be seen from these two papers that the Sheikh's attitude is correct, and leaves no room for a plea that he is the aggressor.

4. This morning while I was drafting this letter the Sheikh came to see me, and said that, though he suspected it before, he received last night reliable evidence from Bagdad that the whole of the present quarrel was the result of a request from his Excellency Nazim Pasha, and is directed towards worrying Mubarek into a request for the intervention of the Turkish authorities in the quarrel, and so forcing an acknowledgment of their right to settle his differences with others. After much pressing the Sheikh gave me the name of his informant, begging me to keep it secret.

It will suffice here to note that this information came from a member of Nazim Pasha's staff, whom he represents as a person of high rank and of great influence.

The suggestion is supported by the fact that, though the Turkish authorities have no cause to interfere in the quarrel, it is in whom they have been unable for more than the last twenty years to extract any revenue either by force or by persuasion.

Nazim Pasha's presence at Bagdad, and, further, the fact that Saadoon had settled his differences with the Turks during his visit to Bagdad, though at what price he did not say.

5. Eventually the Sheikh, who was undoubtedly anxious at the turn affairs have assumed, requested me to explain the position to you, and, if possible, endeavour to bring about a settlement.

The Sheikh went on to say that he would not meet Saadoon and his people just received from Bagdad. He was quite prepared to meet Saadoon and his people the usual Arab way, and felt confident of defeating him signally, but it was evident now that Saadoon's boldness and the Bassorah Vali's efforts to act as a mediator were another step towards opening a door to Turkish intervention. He suggested that the British war-ship in Katharna Bay would ensure the safety of Jahara, and so of Koweit, by showing unmistakably that the British Government were aware of the intrigue, and

Mustafik and Sheikh Mubarek, and in this connection to forward Arabic copies of certain correspondence with which the Sheikh of Koweit has furnished me, and which I regret I am unable to have translated before the closing of the post.

2. The fighting foreshadowed in my diaries is a continuation of the quarrel which formed the subject of reports dated the 9th and 30th March, 25th May, 12th July, and the 28th September, 1910. The Sheikh of Koweit has not done much beyond keeping up a small mobile force near Jahara as a safeguard, whilst during my recent short tour northwards I learned that Sheikh Saadoon was seriously contemplating an expedition which even included a possible attack on Koweit itself. My authority for this is a conversation which I had on the 12th January with one of Saadoon's near relatives at Zubair, who asked me very pointedly whether the British Government would interfere to support Mubarek in the event of the Mustafik actually attacking Jahara or Koweit, though Saadoon was prepared to guarantee that no harm would result to the British representative or British life and property. I contented myself with an evasive answer to the effect that until the Government had accepted I was not in a position to

largely concerned with Koweit as a port to British trade round the way, and therefore I failed to see how they could make a deliberate attempt on the town which must certainly affect them.

My interrogator to draw his own conclusions. As an answer to the question as to being less damaging to both parties, and the general advantage of a return to the status quo, I have to say that I have no objection to the Sheikh of Koweit and Mubarek.

3. I saw the Sheikh yesterday, and he informed me that the Vali of Bassorah had addressed him on the subject of making peace with Saadoon and had offered himself as a mediator. I enclose copies of the Vali's letter to the Sheikh and the Sheikh's reply.

The latter purports to contain a history of the quarrel, and though correct in the main, is to some extent coloured, as might be expected in an account given by one of the parties. After the dispatch of his reply the Sheikh received further news of Saadoon's advance with a large force to within striking distance of Jahara, and he then dispatched his telegram to the Vali, of which also I have the honour to enclose a copy. It will be seen from these two papers that the Sheikh's attitude is correct, and leaves no room for a plea that he is the aggressor.

4. This morning while I was drafting this letter the Sheikh came to see me, and said that, though he suspected it before, he received last night reliable evidence from Bagdad that the whole of the present quarrel was the result of a request from his Excellency Nazim Pasha, and is directed towards worrying Mubarek into a request for the intervention of the Turkish authorities in the quarrel, and so forcing an acknowledgment of their right to settle his differences with others. After much pressing the Sheikh gave me the name of his informant, begging me to keep it secret. It will suffice here to note that this information came from a member of Nazim Pasha's staff, whom he represents as a person of high rank and of great influence.

The suggestion is supported by the fact that, though the Turkish authorities have no cause to interfere in the quarrel, it is in whom they have been unable for more than the last twenty years to extract any revenue either by force or by persuasion.

Nazim Pasha's presence at Bagdad, and, further, the fact that Saadoon had settled his differences with the Turks during his visit to Bagdad, though at what price he did not say.

5. Eventually the Sheikh, who was undoubtedly anxious at the turn affairs have assumed, requested me to explain the position to you, and, if possible, endeavour to bring about a settlement.

The Sheikh went on to say that he would not meet Saadoon and his people just received from Bagdad. He was quite prepared to meet Saadoon and his people the usual Arab way, and felt confident of defeating him signally, but it was evident now that Saadoon's boldness and the Bassorah Vali's efforts to act as a mediator were another step towards opening a door to Turkish intervention.

He suggested that the British war-ship in Katharna Bay would ensure the safety of Jahara, and so of Koweit, by showing unmistakably that the British Government were aware of the intrigue, and



d. I not intend to permit Berloum desert raids to take the form of assaults on coast towns.  
 6. Though the sheikh affects confidence in his own men, I doubt whether he really feels it, and I am certain from outside information that they will be no match for even an inferior number of the resolute Muntakik Arabs. Sheikh Mubarek's force consists of Nomads and townsmen who have no stomach for a steady monthly wage without work, but for actual fighting they have no stomach. These are reinforced by large bands of Bedouins whom I encounter the Muntakik they will probably either desert in a body to the aid of the British, or, I think the presence of a ship of war would certainly check them. It is probable Mubarek's tribesmen would be dismissed, or betake themselves to raiding further inland.

7. If the sheikh's information regarding Turkish connivance in the raid is correct, my own opinion is that it is so, the presence of a man-of-war will have a most marked effect, and it is possible may even cause the Turkish Government to show its hand.

8. I need scarcely repeat how nearly every one of Sheikh Mubarek's difficulties has its origin in Turkish intrigue, or how many of his tribesmen are themselves unconnected with him are utilized to provoke and worry him, whilst at the same time a panderer for all these ills is offered in his acknowledgment of Turkish sovereignty either by insinuating himself or his sons as Turkish subjects or by accepting a Turkish pension. His relations with Turkish officials during the last few years shows that these intrigues will not cease until the Turkish Government is made to realise in the plainest manner that His Majesty's Government are aware of its aims and will not permit them, as disturbing their own relations with the Sheikh of Kuwait. On this ground alone I would solicit your support to the dispatch of a man-of-war to the Gulf. It is becoming more urgent, and I would beg that it may be considered as a matter of course.

### Enclosure 3

#### The Vali of Basrah to Sheikh Mubarek Al Subah

2nd Muharrum, 1329 (January 4, 1911)

Accepting compliments, let it not be hidden from you, in view of the importance for the execution of a military engagement between you and me, and I have now received a reply in which he says that there is absolutely in what has been rumoured about the preparation made by him and that moved from his place up to now, but that when he proceeded to Basrah he was prepared for a reconciliation. In consideration of this his written reply is left to you to say if you have an idea, and if you wish to have confidence to be on your behalf and let me know his name. As to the result of the trial, I am waiting (to hear) the result from you. And salutations to you with God's peace and blessing.

### Enclosure 4

#### Sheikh Mubarek of Kuwait to the Vali of Basrah

(Translated  
(Telegraphic)  
(After compliments.)

Basrah, January 10, 1911

Sandoun had advised your Honour that he had made no preparation and not moved from his place. I represented to you what was necessary in writing, and explained his falsehood. Now he has reached the south west of Safwan which is within my territory, and approached my tribesmen. The state of the tribesmen is known to your Honour, when antagonists approach (each other) it is inevitable that a collision will take place between them. I have therefore written to your Honour's orders, prevent my tribesmen from taking action against him, and stopped them from approaching him, so that nothing whatever may take place before notification reaches your Honour and a reply is received. Now I have represented the circumstance to you, so that you may devise the necessary schemes for his returning to his own place. And if he remained in this place and anything took place I shall not be responsible.

#### Sheikh Mubarek Al Subah to the Vali of Basrah

15th Muharrum, 1329 (January 17, 1911)

(After compliments.) AFTER offering you my last respect I beg to state that I had the honour to receive your communication, dated the 2nd Muharrum, 1329, in which you suggested all what was good and advisable. I thank you for your good wishes and was glad to hear that a reply has been received from Sandoun that he has moved from his place and has not made the least preparation. It is my duty to tell you the truth. As to what he has stated to you that I am not in Basrah, and in the palace in the bush at Ahughar; (I would state that) he is not in his place, but that he has been told that I am in Basrah. I would state that he is not in Basrah, but I say that it is his characteristic which he developed. May God guide him. It is necessary for him to avail himself of this happy time and at the same time to endeavour in the interests of the nation and the Government. May God help us in giving full satisfaction to the officials of our Government.

I your sincere friend, will, God willing, follow a line of conduct which may be most peaceful and truthful, maintain justice and will not, inshallah, deal with the people except according to truth, justice and courtesy. The family of whether Sandoun himself or all the sons of Rashid are dear to me up to now and will remain so afterwards, inshallah, because we were on the most cordial terms with them since we have known all that of his sons, Maowad Pasha and Nuzar Pasha and their sons. And Sandoun does not deny this, and will also not deny my kindness to himself particularly. This his dealing with us does not hurt us, but will hurt his name and honour. The cause which created this ill feeling will be represented to your Honour according to justice and with proofs. In the first instance Oman-al-Rashid, a merchant of Kuwait, as it has employed to the tribesmen with rice, clothes and coffee to be sent to the tribesmen who are on the side of Nejd. From Shammar to Unthar - and Oman's employees sold their goods and purchased camels and sheep and proceeded to our place. This was the first cause of ill feeling. I would state that Sandoun was like a son of mine in my estimation, and was particularly good with me while he was not good to all the world.

Hani Hallaf the sheikh of the Sa'ud tribesmen, seized from the sons of Oman Rashid the camels and sheep which they had bought to the furniture of their houses as well as the sheep belonging to the people of Ja'arah. They introduced him some camels and sheep. I wrote to him, as was the ordinary procedure with him and the other headmen of the tribesmen, whenever there is any plundered property belonging to my subjects with them I write to them and they return the same. The sheikh of the Dhaif Hamoudie-Sowath, had hatched them and gave Sandoun a share of the camels and sheep belonging to the people of Kuwait. I wrote to the Hallaf

... both he and Saadoon were inspired with covetousness. At the same time Khalf Nakibullah happened to be with Saadoon on a visit, because he had been invited to proceed on a journey with the ... and halted near my tribesmen. My ... on an excursion ... who were with him, saying ... my son Jaber, whom he informed of the statement of ... He (Jaber) thanked him, and he also received a letter from Saadoon containing expressions of friendship and kind regards. A day after some one came to my son Jaber from tribesmen who were at a distance of eight hours' journey, informing him that they were attacked by Saadoon and plundered. On learning this Jaber told Seyid Khalaf -

How is this? were these messages from Saadoon a trick by which ... duped through you? We will have to go to him and recover the loot from him.

Seyid Khalaf assured him that he himself was ... property from him. When Seyid Khalaf met Saadoon he (the Seyid) ... he (Saadoon) acted very badly and that he (Saadoon) had both deceived ... that he should now return the loot, otherwise it would be ... replied -

"It does not matter, the plunder is ... them their property."

My son Jaber sent the plundered ... worth mentioning in connection with the ... continued between me and ... remained with him, and the ...

... otherwise as regards Saadoon and all Saadoon ... agree that the least thing should be done by us against them purposely at present and in future. My son Jaber and Abdul Aziz al Saoud learnt that on his return Saadoon was plundered by the Ibn Hazal and his tribesmen of Aqabah when he attacked them, and that he returned and went to his ... at Abaghar, ... that the Saouds separated from him ... themselves of this opportunity, and when they reached near the Arabs they ... men and that there was a tent with them, which, as they had understood, belonged to Saadoon. The spies also stated that according to what they saw there was ... with the Arabs. They (Jaber and Abdul Aziz) abstained from attacking the Arabs the morning owing to the fact that Saadoon was with them. They sent off certain horsemen to fire at the Arabs in order that they ...

... and horses to graze, and they did not take the offensive by way of avenging some politeness. Seeing this negligence on their part Saadoon collected the ... of Adh Dhahr who were with him as well as the mounted horsemen of Muntalik, attacked their animals and plundered them in the pastures. This is the fact of this case, and I have truthfully represented to you what has happened. Now, God willing, I will take no action against Saadoon, but against the tribesmen who adopted the path of villainy and who are not from amongst his dependents the Muntalik. When ... and any opportunity we will punish him for the sake of the security of the ... of the persons who carry on business from Khambayah to Zubair, Kuwait as at Hura. Now, in compliance with your command I will make no preparation ... Saadoon, and so long as he is remaining with the bandits I will avoid the ... succeeds in separating them. It is incumbent on him to abide by ... commands and deal with you honestly. According to what he has ... Honour be had ...

... and ...

deceived by him, and have been forcibly collected by him in order that he may support himself by them. He has deceived them that they would be plundered if they separate. They have been safe all these years and we are guarding them, and they were not the victims of the tribesmen from the first. A month and a half ago I wrote to ... to go to their former habitats and disperse for the purpose of feeding their animals and that I shall have nothing with Saadoon except what is good; but that what he did to us did not hurt us, but injure himself and his name. As to Saadoon's situation ... I for me to represent them to you, as your Honour will learn (them) from official archives. With regard to Saadoon's claim for ... of the Dhafir tribesmen which were plundered by the sheikh of the ... Dhafir were on these terms from ancient time, and so were the other tribesmen. Further, ... with us or with Saadoon. Now, as regards above-mentioned plundered property ... way he should, according to the usage of ... and he free from this shame, and ... But if he is actuated by meanness, we are ... and this fact will remain in the memory of the Arabs. As to your Honour's order that I should nominate ... to you the facts and choose your own justice, so that Saadoon may not cause mischief in this side. I have addressed you in order to explain the circumstances, and hope that your kind attention will continue. In any case, order and decision will rest with your Honour.

Enclosure 6.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cox to Commander of His Majesty's ship ...

(Telegraphic) P. ... Bahrain, January, ...  
Please send following to political agent, Kuwait, through "Phakmal"

... early. - Please telegraph briefly whether there is any change in position since ... sent to ... could not get ...

Enclosure 7.

Commander of His Majesty's ship "Fox," at Jask, to Lieutenant-Colonel Cox

Jask, January 28, 1911

Following from Shikhsagar to resident -

Your telegram, 27th.

Saadoon has written for peace sending letter by Hussarah merchants, and Mubarak has replied to-day accepting terms on condition two Dhafir shikhs come in. Mubarak considers peace arrangeable on these terms. Saadoon, however, still near Safwan, and I think that, though attacks now improbable, chance of peaceful solution will be improved ...

"Phakmal" can remain indolent ...



Lieutenant-Colonel (or to Commander of His Majesty's ship "Fox" ...)

(Telegraphic) P.

Kindly wire following to Shakespeare, Rowett, through "Edinboro".

Bushers, dunnos

Your ...

... naval officer can spare "Philomel" for the moment

10491

Page

1) Bassora, par Zouba ... 4 d'Etat d'Etat  
Bassora et un autre sur le pont terminus de la ligne aboutissant au Golfe  
(3) le privilège de tout embranchement partant de la voie principale et de la  
la mer, dans la zone comprise entre Meram et Tripoli de Syrie  
A la garantie kilométrique de ...  
revenus spéciaux, c'est-à-dire les excédents des revenus concédés à la ...  
certaines dimes. Cette obligation formelle contractée vis-à-vis de la ...  
le Gouvernement ottoman dans une situation difficile au point de vue de la réalisation de  
certains de ses projets. On connaît les péripéties des négociations relatives à la  
régénération douanière de ... pour ce ... Le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté ...  
pour ces conditions particulières pour y consentir

types du Canal de Fer de Bagdad

D'autre part, l'exploitation de la

et préliminaire dans l'opinion publique n

ne intérêts commerciaux britanniques

La présence de la nécessité de la majoration douanière de 4

décor du Gouvernement impérial d'arriver

de la ligne malgré Bagdad Golfe ... en satisfaisant tous les intérêts

la Société de l'Etat a pris soin

des intérêts des ex-sultans

les termes de l'accord inter

la Chéouan de Fer de Bagdad

l'Espagne consent à renoncer au sur

pour les recettes provenant de la pr

la Société (patente) Elle re

Bagdad Golfe Persique, a

sur le Golfe Persique en faveur de la non

laquelle la Compagnie de Bagdad consent à être

ou toutes. Néanmoins, elle tient à ce que sa participa

d'une nation libre non ottomane. Elle se réserve le de

laquelle compagnie ottomane ou avec l'Etat ottoman p

objet de la perte sur elle à la suite

ouque, dont la construction est plus facile

sur de ... la compagnie déclare

l'achèvement de la ligne jusqu'à Bagdad les reven

c'est-à-dire le surplus actuel des reve

affectées. Conformément à sa concession

Chanaue Alexandrette et un port

garantie kilométrique

VI

pour traiter avec le Gouvernement britannique  
débouchant au Golfe Persique, une solution





[10573]

No. 186.

*Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March**(No. 65)**(Telegraphic.) P.**St. Petersburg, March 22, 1911*

PERSIAN railways. My telegram No. 62 of . . .

In conversation with Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs to-day I again explained position with regard to the Mohammerah Khorremabad sch.

M. Neratow put forward as a personal suggestion the idea that the northern terminus of the line might be placed further south than Khorremabad, at some point further removed from the frontier of the Russian zone. He thought that Russian consent to the scheme would be facilitated by such an arrangement. In reply to this suggestion, I argued that it was hardly fair for Russia to prevent British goods from passing even the borders of her zone when she was about to admit German goods to the very heart of it. M. Neratow replied that, as His Majesty's Government were bound at present to secure an option for construction, they might, as a first step, the course which he had suggested.

I then proceeded to explain that the line now projected would only serve to divert trade which already passed into Persia by the Bagdad route. In reply to

query from M. Neratow as to the use which British trade made at present of the route by the Karun, I said that I was not in a position to answer this question off-hand.

He then asked whether, in the event of Russia consenting to our scheme, His Majesty's Government would be willing to encourage British capital to participate in the construction of railways in North Persia. I reminded him that we had already offered to do so as regards a line from Julfa southwards, but he said that what he had in mind was the line from Enzeli to Tehran. I suggested that the representative of the English syndicate, who at the present moment was in negotiation with the Minister of the Interior for the construction of the Julfa Tabreez line, might perhaps be induced to interest his principals in the Enzeli Tehran sch.

In asking me to submit these two suggestions to you, M. Neratow begged me to point out that they were of a purely personal character.

[10463]

No. 187

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir H. Barclay.**(No. 84)**(Telegraphic.) P.**Foreign Office, . . .*

RAILWAYS in Persia

Are you still of view that we should be well advised not to remind Regent of undertaking made by Shah?

[10827]

No. 188.

*Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan**(No. 87)**St.**Foreign Office, March 22, 1911*

I SPOKE to Count Benckendorff to-day on the subject of Persian railways, telling him generally what you had said.

I explained that a concession for a railway from Mohammerah was required to protect our interests. Of course, if we were quite sure that British trade would be at no disadvantage on the Bagdad line, the railway from Mohammerah might never be made, unless private enterprise was willing to undertake its construction.

I reminded Count Benckendorff that M. Sazonow had promised at Potsdam that a connection would be provided between the Bagdad Railway and Tehran. The Russian Council of Ministers had at once pointed out that, if access was to be given to Tehran,

Russia must have a railway from Enzeli, which would enable Russian trade to compete with German trade. This seemed so vital to M. Sazonow that he had even asked for British capital to help in making the line, in order to protect Russian trade. It was just as vital for us to be sure of some means which would enable British trade to compete with German trade in the same market. M. Stolypin had admitted the force of your arguments, but had said that Russian feeling

[10682]

No. 188\*

Sir G. Barclay to Sir Edward Grey. (Received March 23.)

(No. 10)

Tehran, March 23, 1911

RAILWAYS Reference to your telegram No. 87 of the 14th March to St. Petersburg.

M. Pokrowski has telegraphed to his Government, who enquired his views on the subject of the proposed application for a concession for the Mohammerah Railway, that it would be difficult to object to the line in the face of the negotiations which took place between the two Governments in 1908. Russian Minister has further pointed out that railway construction in Persia cannot be indefinitely hung up, and has suggested that simultaneous construction of a railway from the north might mitigate the injurious effect that proposed line would have on Russian trade.

[10902]

No. 189\*

Sir G. Barclay to Sir Edward Grey. (Received March 24.)

No. 92)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, March 24, 1911

RAILWAYS

In reply to your telegram No. 84 of the 22nd March, I have the honour to state that there appears to me to be no reason why we should further postpone the ~~question~~, but I think that, as the Persian Government is now constitutional, the communication in question should be addressed to Minister for Foreign Affairs rather than to Nasir-ul-Mulk.

I should also like to approach the Regent privately first to ascertain his Highness's views on the subject, and then to approach the Government in a reasonable spirit. I would propose at the same time to assure the Shah's Government that we are prepared to accept the Shah's receipt. His Majesty's Government are, I think, prepared for a report on the subject of railways.

could never be reconciled to our proposal. With regard to this, I pointed out that at Potsdam M. Sazonow had obtained certain advantages for Russia, but these advantages could not be had without corresponding disadvantages.

Count Benckendorff asked me how we could suffer if there were equal rights for all trade on the Bagdad Railway.

I replied that supposing, for the sake of argument, there was a certain class of cotton goods, made chiefly in Germany and exported to Persia, which competed with a class of cotton goods made chiefly in England, and also exported to Persia.

It might be arranged so that they were low on the Bagdad Railway and high on the woollen goods. It might be contended, if we complained, the rates on the woollen goods made in Germany were just as high as those on the woollen goods made in England, while the rates on the cotton goods made in England were just as low as those on the cotton goods made in Germany; and that there was, therefore, no breach of the conditions of the Bagdad Railway concession. But, in practice, there would be great damage done to British trade.

I am, &c.  
E. GREY

[10716]

No. 189

Board of Trade to Foreign Office. (Received March 24.)

Board of Trade, March 22, 1911.

I AM directed by the Board of Trade to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th March, and enclosures, with regard to the Persian Gulf section of the Bagdad Railway and other matters relating thereto.

With reference thereto, I am to say that the Board of Trade are examining with care the various points specified in your letter. In view, however, of the grave and complex considerations, both political and commercial, involved in the whole problem, Mr. Buxton doubts if these particular points can be usefully or adequately dealt with as a general question of policy, and he is therefore disposed to suggest, for consideration, that, instead of dealing with the matter by international conference could take place between heads of departments, at which the whole matter could be discussed.

I am, &c.  
H. LLEWELLYN SMITH

10573]

No. 190

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan

(No. 29.)

Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, March 24, 1911

AM I to understand from your telegram No. 65 that we may apply for an option to construct a railway as far as Khorramabad, as far as the Russian Government are concerned, if we undertake not to proceed to construct until we have come to an agreement with them on points at issue? As far as I am aware there is no suitable place between Diefel and Khorramabad where a line could stop, and we should not be obtaining an undue advantage as the Russian Government contemplate the construction of a line from north to south.

I would give every encouragement to a proposal on the lines of Lord Grimthorpe's negotiations, of which I have been informed, on the understanding that Russia would not oppose a line to Khorramabad, which the Russian Government or the Persian Government might eventually link up with Tehran, and there could be no objection on our part if the Russian Government prefer to construct a line from Enzeh to Tehran, and can interest British capital in the scheme.

Imports from the United Kingdom into Arabistan for the years 1907-8 and 1908-9 amounted to 135,000L and 81,000L respectively; while those from India for the same years amounted to 107,000L and 104,000L, as can be seen from the trade returns, owing entirely to the imports of machinery of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, a temporary cause, the figures for 1909-10 show a large increase.



[11020]

No. 191.

*Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 26.)*

(No. 67.)

(Telegraphic) P.

Constantinople, March 26, 1911

MESOPOTAMIAN irrigation.

His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad yesterday informed me by telegraph that he had just heard from irrigation engineers there that the construction of well Bagdad-Bassorah railway would not be possible, save at a prohibitive price. Considerable progress was made with the irrigation and drainage works which he considers of favourable significance, Mr. Lorimer attaches

[11021]

*Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 26.)*

(No. 68.)

(Telegraphic) P.

Constantinople, March 26, 1911

BAGDAD Railway terminus.

In accordance with your instructions, I repeated to His Majesty's consul at Bassorah your telegram No. 67 of the 22nd instant, repeating to me a telegram from the Consul at Basra, and asked for his observations on it. I have now received a telegram from Mr. Crow stating that he knows nothing of this rumour. The name of the captain from whom the Government investigations would be made was

[11019]

*Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 26.)*

(No. 7.)

(Telegraphic) P.

St. Petersburg, March 26, 1911

IRANIAN railways.

From the terms of your telegram No. 99 of the 24th March I fear that the sense

M. Nératow lay I told him that the proposal that could be fixed at a point south of Khorramabad was impossible. I added that I was disappointed that the Russian Government had not yet seen their way to giving us a favourable reply. M. Nératow attributed the delay to the Ministerial crisis, and said that he was awaiting a report on the scheme from the Minister of Commerce. I begged that he would let me have a reply at the earliest possible moment.

I also saw the official who is in charge of the Persian section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who told me that Russia is swayed by strategical as well as commercial considerations. Her railway from Julfa to Tabreez. Any extension to the south of that point would be exposed to Turkish attack, and it was therefore undesirable to prolong the line at present to Khorramabad.

I told him what you had said as to British capital participating in the construction of the line from Enzeli to Teheran, and suggested the possibility of that line being taken up eventually with our projected railway from Meshammereh.

11047

No. 191

*Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 26.)*

St. Petersburg, March 26, 1911

In a conversation which I had with the Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs last week I spoke to his Excellency on the subject of the Meshammereh-Khorramabad line, and suggested that he should warn the President of the Council that I proposed to discuss the question with him in the course of the interview which he was to grant yesterday. M. Nératow expressed the opinion that, while the Russian Government might raise no difficulties to our asking for an option to construct this line, the would be different when the time came for asking their consent to its actual

M. Stolyppin's reception of the proposal was even less favourable. After reading my telegram, which I had handed him in accordance with the instructions conveyed to me in your telegram No. 87 of the 14th instant, he conveyed to me with a smile that I was really not

the proposed Government had no legitimate right to oppose its construction, though it was one to which they had very strong objections. The Moscow merchants and all those who were interested in Persian trade would at once declare against the construction of a line that would bring British goods right up to the Russian sphere, while they would represent England as

I reminded his Excellency that, before his departure for Potsdam, M. Sazonov had explained to us the reasons which make it imperative for Russia to meet Germany's wishes with regard to the linking of the Bagdad Railway with the future North

proposed in the construction of the Bagdad Railway. We did not wish to stand in the way of what many reasons for objecting to it, because we did not wish to stand in the way of what

We hoped, therefore, that Russia would in the present case show equal consideration for our interests. His Excellency would have seen from the recent debates in the House of Commons that the proposed construction of the Khorramabad Railway was viewed with some apprehension in England. In order that we might be able to compete on equal terms with Germany, and to guard against the danger of differential rates being in one manner or another applied to our

railways, it was necessary that we should open up a new route for them by way of Meshammereh and Khorramabad. All that we wanted to do was to open two

to prevent fouling, and it did not at all follow that the cost of the line would really increase the volume of that trade. But it would

valued about 1,000,000/ entered Persia every year by the way of Bagdad and Khorramabad and this trade would, were the railway to be built, be carried on by Meshammereh and Khorramabad instead of by Bagdad. The Moscow merchants seemed to think that they could place a veto on all railway construction in Persia, but this was now no longer possible. By her agreement with Germany Russia was opening Western Persian goods, and she could not with a good grace shut that door in the face

belonging to a friend. His Excellency was unable to contest the justice of these arguments, but was evidently not prepared to face the opposition which the construction of the proposed

ment of the Russian Government, is likely to evoke in this country. He enquired whether the goods with which we supplied Persia were of the same class as those which Russia exported to that country, as in the matter of textiles the Russians were being undersold by the Germans, and he feared that British textile goods would also be cheaper than those exported from Russia. I said that I could not give him any information on this point at present, but that we were anxious to do all that we could to safeguard Russia's commercial interests. For the moment all that we wanted to do was to obtain the option of the line, and he might rest assured that we would proceed to construct it without a thorough discussion of all matters relating to it with the Russian Government.

M. Stolyppin remarked that the illness of M. Sazonov placed him at a great disadvantage, and rendered it difficult for him to come to a decision. I said that I

and deeply regretted the fact that M. Sazonov should be incapacitated by illness at the present moment, all the more so that I had hoped that, had he been able to carry out his intention of going to London, he would have been able to discuss this other outstanding question with you. M. Stolypin replied that it was most important that M. Sazonov should pay his promised visits to Paris and London in May, and in view of the progress which he had made towards recovery in the last few days, he thought that it was most probable that he would do so.

After taking leave of his Excellency I again urged him to consent to our appointment to the Persian Government for the concession, and suggested that we might have the detailed discussion as to the construction of the line till M. Sazonov was sufficiently recovered to receive me, or till he went to London and was able to talk the matter over with you. M. Stolypin enquired whether I was in a hurry for an answer and on my replying in the affirmative, said that he would consult the Minister of Commerce and endeavour to let me know the decision of the Russian Government in the course of the week.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN

P.S. March 22. - In a conversation which I had with the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, I went over the whole question once more with his Excellency and endeavoured to make our position clear to him.

M. Neratov put forward two personal suggestions which he begged me to submit as likely to facilitate a solution of the question. In the first place, he expressed an opinion that the Russian Government were more likely to withdraw their opposition to the proposed line if it were to stop short of Khorramabad, so that its northern terminus might be at a greater distance from the Russian zone. I told M. Neratov that I was too ignorant of the geography of the district through which the proposed railway was to pass to be able to say whether such a suggestion was feasible or not. It seemed to me, however, that, now that Russia was about to open the very heart of her zone to German goods, the least she could do was to allow British goods to reach the gates of that zone, and that it would not be fair to refuse us this. M. Neratov replied that as it was only now a question of asking for an option, we might be contented with this as a first step. He then put forward his second suggestion, which was to the effect that we might encourage the participation of British capital in the railway which Russia proposed to construct in Northern Persia.

I reminded him that we had already promised to see how far we could induce British capital to interest itself in a line from Julfa to the north, should Russia wish to build one, to join the line which we propose constructing from Mohammereh to Khorramabad; but his Excellency gave me to understand that such a line would not be of great attraction for Russia at the present moment, and that he was attaching less value to it. I told him that a representative of a British syndicate, Messrs. A. & C., was at this moment negotiating with the Minister of Finance for the construction of the line from Julfa to Tabriz, and that it was, therefore, probable that he or his friends might equally interest themselves in the Khorramabad line.

In the course of our conversation I tried to impress on M. Neratov the fact that we were not aiming at more than the maintenance of our trade with Persia on its present footing, and that the Mohammereh line would but serve to carry the goods which at present enter Persia by way of Khorramabad. His Excellency expressed the opinion that we should find the line a very difficult one to construct, and asked me several questions as to the use we were making at present of the Karun route for trade.

G. W. B.

Enclosure in No. 124.

*Aide-memoire communicated to M. Stolypin by Sir G. Buchanan*

DANS une conversation qu'il a eue le 11 (24) février avec le Ministre des Affaires

étrangères, M. Stolypin a exprimé son opinion que le Gouvernement Impérial devrait consulter le Gouvernement Impérial avant d'en demander la concession au Gouvernement persan.

Or, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté estime qu'il y aura intérêt de s'adresser au Gouvernement persan pour la concession de ladite ligne. Il est possible que pour le moment que d'acquiescer l'option pour la construction de ladite ligne que du port à Khorramabad, avant de se prévaloir de cette option, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté se propose d'engager une discussion détaillée avec le Gouvernement Impérial. Il ne manquera pas non plus de prêter l'attention la plus sérieuse aux moyens de sauvegarder les intérêts commerciaux de la Russie.

Pour le cas où le Gouvernement Impérial aurait l'intention de mettre en exécution le projet d'une ligne qui, partant de Djoulfa, se raccorderait avec la ligne Mohammereh-Khorramabad, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté avisera jusqu'à quel point il serait possible d'encourager la participation des capitaux britanniques dans cette entreprise.

Signé: L'Amiral, le 5 (18) mars, 1911.

(11080)

No. 195

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey. (Received March 27)

(No. 183. Confidential)

Constantinople, March 22, 1911

Sir,

WITH reference to my telegrams Nos. 62 and 63 of the 18th March and yesterday, I have the honour to enclose translations of the conventions signed yesterday between the Ottoman Government and the Bagdad Railway Company respecting —

- 1. The Helif-Bagdad sections
- 2. The Alexandretta-Osmanie branch, and
- 3. Alexandretta port

These were accompanied by a declaration of the company renouncing its right conditionally to the Bagdad-Gulf section and the ports at Basorah and the terminus, of which the Minister for Foreign Affairs promises to give me details to-morrow. The sum required for the kilometre guarantee and working expenses amounts roughly to £T 400,000, while the surplus receipts assigned in virtue of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 2 of the convention of yesterday yield about £T. 405,000, according to the latest returns, i.e., £T 290,000 from the surplus taxes earmarked for the Helif-Basorah, Basorah-Angora-Konia-Baghdad sections, and some £T 115,000 from the revenues surplus for the Bagdad-Helif sections, as shown in the annexed table.\*

According to articles 3 and 4, the company undertakes to complete the sections from Helif to Bagdad within five years from the date of approval of the plans and surveys, which are to be prepared and approved within fourteen months from yesterday. To accomplish this there is a natural desire to set to work as soon as possible from both ends, and consequently a corresponding anxiety to have no time in coming to a final settlement with England and France regarding the Bagdad-Gulf

As regards the branch from Alexandretta to Osmaniye, it is to be constructed without kilometre guarantee and within two years from the date of approval of the plans, which are to be presented to the Ministry within nine months from the present

Like the port of Alexandretta, the termination of the concession is made to synchronise with that of the section ending 200 kilom east of Helif, i.e., in the vicinity of Mosul.

The plans for the port at Alexandretta are to be ready within fifteen months from yesterday, and the works are to be completed within four years of the date of their approval. This part is in a way a set-off against the Gulf port and that of Basorah granted to the company by the original firm, but now relinquished, together with their exclusive right to the Bagdad-Gulf sections of the railway.

I am informed that the German company also reserves to itself the right to come to terms with the new company as to the indemnity to be paid by the latter to compensate it for the loss suffered in not constructing that section.

Musem Djahid Bey, in the "Tanin," which is practically the organ of the Minister of Finance, and other Government organs, express great pleasure at the conclusion of these conventions, and the hope that they will lead to a similar settlement with Great Britain in the matter of the Gulf sections, Kuwait, and "other parts of Ottoman

\* This table is inaccurate, see corrected one in Sir G. Lowther's No. 196 of March 25, 1911





Art. 8. Les actions à émettre pour la construction de la ligne...

Art. 9. Les articles 45 et 46 de la convention du 5...

Art. 10. Le Gouvernement ne pourra acheter ce...

Art. 11. Dans le cas où des tarifs communs seraient établis entre les lignes de Bagdad et le tronçon dont il est question, ils seront repartis proportionnellement aux distances parcourues sur les deux lignes.

### III. Le Port d'Alexandrette.

Article 1<sup>er</sup>. Le Gouvernement ottoman cède à la S. M. I. le port de Haïdar-Pacha la concession de construire un port à Alexandrette...

Les conditions de cette concession sont identiques à celles de la convention en date du 3 (15) mars, 1899 (1315), concernant le port de Haïdar-Pacha, sauf les modifications apportées par le présent contrat.

Art. 3. La durée de la concession expirera en même temps que la concession de la partie de la voie ferrée de Bagdad se prolongeant entre Hâf et le 207 kilomètre de la voie.

Art. 4. Les projets relatifs à la construction du port devront être soumis au Ministère des Travaux publics au plus tard dans un délai de quinze mois à partir de la date de cette convention.

Art. 5. Les tarifs à appliquer seront soumis au Gouvernement ottoman pour approbation.

Art. 6. Les recettes du port d'Alexandrette et de l'échelle de Papaz pour l'échelle de Papaz...

Art. 7. Les recettes du port d'Alexandrette et de l'échelle de Papaz...

Art. 8. La compagnie procédera à la construction des quais, sans exiger du Gouvernement ottoman...

Art. 9. Les recettes du port d'Alexandrette ainsi que celles de l'échelle de Papaz, si elle est construite, ne seront pas comprises dans celles du port de Haïdar-Pacha.

Art. 10. Sur les recettes brutes du port d'Alexandrette et de l'échelle de Papaz, si elle est construite—les recettes provenant de l'emploi des fonds de réserve de la compagnie non comprises—seront prélevées: (1) Les frais d'administration, de construction, de renouvellement et d'entretien des machines, et (2) les intérêts de 6 pour cent et l'amortissement jusqu'à la fin de la durée de la concession du capital nécessaire pour les travaux de fondation.

Le montant du capital en question sera fixé par les bilans confirmés par l'assemblée générale des ports en de titres. La compagnie est tenue de communiquer ces bilans au Ministère des Travaux publics.

Art. 11. Si les recettes nettes de la ligne d'Osmanie et de Mouctapha-Pacha—Alexandrette...

Art. 12. Si les recettes nettes de la ligne d'Osmanie et de Mouctapha-Pacha—Alexandrette...

Art. 13. Si les recettes nettes de la ligne d'Osmanie et de Mouctapha-Pacha—Alexandrette...

Art. 14. Si les recettes nettes de la ligne d'Osmanie et de Mouctapha-Pacha—Alexandrette...

Art. 15. Si les recettes nettes de la ligne d'Osmanie et de Mouctapha-Pacha—Alexandrette...

du port d'Alexandrette sera affecté en premier lieu à couvrir d'abord toute différence en moins sur les recettes de la ligne d'Alexandrette et ensuite à la clôture des comptes de la ligne.

Art. 16. Le Gouvernement ne pourra racheter la concession du port d'Alexandrette et de l'échelle de Papaz, si elle est construite, qu'à condition d'acheter en même temps le tronçon du chemin de fer de Bagdad entre Boulogourou et Haïdar-Pacha.

Art. 17. La compagnie s'engage à ne pas céder à un tiers la concession du port de Haïdar-Pacha, ni celle du port d'Alexandrette et de l'échelle de Papaz, si elle est construite.

Art. 18. Les dispositions de l'article 19 de la convention en date du 3 (15) mars, 1899 (1315), ne sont pas applicables au port d'Alexandrette et à l'échelle de Papaz, si elle est construite.

### Minutes.

The interesting communication will be the one which Rifaat Pasha was to give Sir G. Lowther on the 2nd March (see the first page of this dispatch) about the Gulf question.

and El Katr are important: if we could get a settlement of these questions it would be a distinct accomplishment, and we should be able to meet the customs increase without such a settlement. The attitude of the British Government during these negotiations will be curious to watch. She apparently has no objection to a settlement, and therefore may urge moderation on the Turks. On the other hand, it might be unwise to concede in her until she comes out into the open, as it is always possible she is up to double-dealing.

Mr. Millett to Sir G. Lowther, 27 March, 1911.

to me important steadily to keep in mind the main object we have in view, namely, the safeguarding of British interests in the Persian Gulf and, more broadly, in the East. It was because we considered those interests threatened by the German monopolistic railway scheme that we have declined to assist Turkey, or German financiers, in carrying out that scheme. Our attitude has resulted in the impression of obtaining from Germany a freer hand in regard to the Bagdad-Gulf section of the railway, so that Turkey now has something to offer to us, in return for which we are expected to consent to increase of customs and to allow British money to be made available for the railway. It is the customs, and our hold on Kuwait, which have been the lever by which we are beginning to secure some success. This lever is available as against Turkey, and it is from Turkey that we want a satisfactory arrangement respecting the position at Kuwait and generally on the coast of the Gulf. Therefore we should as well to continue negotiating with Turkey.

It is true that we are also desirous of coming to an understanding with Germany, but this seems to me, at this stage, not the primary, but the secondary, consideration. It is probably more important to us to get a favourable settlement of the Gulf question in general than to agree about the exact proportion of British participation in the railway.

It is moreover only too likely, because in accordance with our long experience of German diplomacy, that if we were to agree to negotiate with Germany direct, she would after driving the hardest possible bargain with us, finally turn round to the Turks and, by some systematic misrepresentation such as their inspired organs are masters of, get Turkey to believe that it was England that was contemptuous of Turkish interests.

If we do not get satisfaction out of the Turks as regards our position in the Gulf we shall gain practically nothing by any agreement with Germany. On the other hand, a direct negotiation with Germany might bear no direct fruit, and yet we might still come to a satisfactory arrangement with Turkey. Everything therefore points to the wisdom of negotiating direct with Turkey in the first instance and as the most important part of any attempt to carry out our policy.



ation which we may enter on simultaneously with Germany, planned to be subject to the reservation that it can lead to no agreement of any satisfactory terms from Turkey. By making this hope to enlist German support in inducing Turkey to come to terms, and I see no reason why we should not ask Germany definitely to use her influence in that direction.

This presupposes that, as a preliminary, we have made it quite clear to our own minds what British requirements are, and I would strongly deprecate entering into further discussion with Germany unless we have reached that state of clearness.

Foreign Office, March 27, 1911

L. A. C.

R. P. M.

L. C.

11046

P.

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir L. Herbert Grey — Received March 2

(No. 67) Confidential  
Sir,

St. Petersburg, March 22, 1911

WITH reference to your despatch No. 71, Confidential of the 8th instant I have the honour to state that, in the course of a conversation which I had with him this morning, Mr. Williams informed me that the negotiations which he has been conducting with the Minister of Finance on the subject of a scheme for the construction of a railway from Jolfa to Tabreez have been somewhat delayed owing to the Minister's illness. The Russian Government, he said, wanted to keep the control and working of the line in their own hands and to come to terms with his syndicate for its financing and construction. All that they have to offer in the way of guarantee is the stock amounting to 4,000,000 roubles, when they hold in the existing road concessions the success of the negotiations will depend apparently on whether they are able to offer any real security to intending investors. Therefore any definite arrangement can be concluded, have to obtain projected railway from the Persian Government, and I gather from what Mr. Williams told me that they would prefer not to do this immediately, though he mentioned that one of the officials of the Ministry of Finance would probably proceed shortly to Teheran in connection with this railway project.

From a strategical point of view the railway would be of advantage to Russia in the event of a Turkish occupation of the Urmiah district, while it will also not promote her commercial intercourse with Persia.

I may mention that Mr. Williams does not seem to take the same keen interest in this scheme since his attention has been attracted to another one for the construction of grade roads in Siberia. He also seems to be in favour of the construction of a syndicate with a capital of some

have, &

GEORGE W. BUCHANAN

[11030]

No. 137

Sir E. Goschen to Sir L. Herbert Grey — Received March 2

Berlin, March 24, 1911.

semi-official "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" of the agreements recently concluded between the Ottoman Government and the Bagdad Railway Company.

This communiqué has been received with the greatest satisfaction by the rest of the German press, and all the most important newspapers have jubilant articles on the subject.

The "Kreuz Zeitung" says that the agreements have given equal satisfaction in obtaining the concession for the building of the Alexandretta-Osmanli branch line.

Turkey by the renunciation by

It particularly points out that the renunciation of its claim to the proceeds of the anticipated 4 per cent. customs increase has simplified matters for Turkey, and will prevent the consent of other Powers to that increase being used as a lever to extract unwilling concessions from her, or to exercise pressure on the Sultan's Powers.

It appears from this observation that, in the opinion of the "Kreuz Zeitung," the release by the company of the proceeds of the 4 per cent. increase will be the removal of all opposition to that increase on the part of other Governments.

The article goes on to say that by the present agreements Turkey has gained greater freedom of action, and has in any case gained time so that she can approach any

or forced into decisions

as those put forward

regards Koweit

It adds, "and the German concessionaires are under any necessity of coming to any immediate decision with regard to any concessions which may be offered by other Powers interested."

It then turns more particularly to the question of the northern section of the Bagdad Railway, and in that connection it sounds a note of warning. It says that while the postponement of international difficulties as regards the railway up to Bagdad may be regarded with satisfaction, the postponement of the difficulties regarding the

exercise of the greatest circumspection and vigilance. It was true that in renouncing its right to construct this section the company had stipulated that the German share in the new company to be formed should not be less than the share of any other non-Ottoman Power. The French press had objected to this part of the company was illusory, as the Germans and the Turks could always outvote the French and the English. This was, however, no certainty, and it might easily happen that, if German capital was only assured a share equal to that of other Powers, circumstances might arise in which an Anglo-French combination might gain the upper hand. "We must therefore," it continues, "not shut our eyes to the danger that the influence of German capital may become illusory, that England from the south may get the deciding influence over the Bagdad Railway, and the Suez Canal drawn by her again. In this way England is seeking real and lasting advantages, both political and commercial. Germany, on the other hand, politically

cycle of the

advantages which it is desired to obtain by them.

This article has every appearance of being prepared by the Imperial Foreign Office, and if it is so, the somewhat pessimistic remarks as regards the Gulf section of the line and the solemn words of warning addressed to the directors of the Bagdad Railway Company need not be taken very seriously. These remarks and warnings do not appear to me to have a very true ring, and I think they may be taken as an attempt not to appear too jubilant over what most of the German papers hail as a "triumphant

The "Kölnische Zeitung" expresses complete satisfaction with the agreement. It reminds its readers that it was not so long ago that in Germany as well as in France the realization only in the distant future. But the German financial group which was a shadowy dream might now be regarded as being well within the range of practical possibilities.

In another place, the article remarks that the Bagdad Railway Company had done Turkey very good service by giving up its claim to the proceeds of the 4 per cent. customs increase. It had furnished the guarantee which you had stated in the House

of Commons to be indispensable for the safeguarding of British commercial interests, which was that the yield from the customs increase should not benefit a line the completion of which was calculated to injure those interests. This being so, it might be assumed that no further obstacles would be placed in the way of Turkey opening up a source of revenue in the manner which she contemplated.

I have &  
W E GOSCHEN

Enclosure in No. 107

"Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" of March 23, 1911

As has already been announced elsewhere, various agreements were concluded yesterday at Constantinople between the Turkish Government and the German Bagdad Company to ensure the completion of the construction of the line as far as Bagdad.

The object of these treaties is to place the construction, which was already ensured by the original concession, on such a financial basis that it can be carried out.

These agreements come into consideration. In the first, guarantees are given to the company instead of their claims on the yield of the 4 per cent. customs increase, which was planned, but later refused by the Powers. These guarantees permit the company construction within 5 years after the sanction of the plans. The company is by enabled also to commence construction immediately. They were therefore to enter into an obligation to keep the term of 5 years.

In the second agreement, the company are granted the construction of a branch line from Damascus to Alexandretta, which will establish the shortest line from Aleppo to the Mediterranean.

A third agreement grants to the Bagdad Company the development of the natural harbour of Alexandretta, on the same conditions on which the construction of the harbour of Haidar Paşa at the point of origin of the Anatolian Railway opposite Constantinople was granted to it.

As to the continuation of the line from Bagdad to the Persian Gulf, a detailed agreement has yet been concluded. Nevertheless, on the occasion of the conclusion of the other agreements, the Bagdad Railway as holder also of the concession for the Gulf section, has reported to the Turkish Government, for this part of the line, the offer which it had already made in 1903 for the entire Bagdad section.

This offer was made to the effect that the construction should be transferred to a company, in which, while the acquired rights of the first company were taken into account, both the Turkish Government and capital of other countries should participate.

In 1903 this offer failed, in face of the refusal of British capital to participate in the construction of its demands for control over the final Gulf section.

By the conciliatory attitude of the German Bagdad Company, the Turkish Government has once more been afforded the possibility of making advances to British capital and of inviting its co-operation. Though it is true, its maximum is not to exceed

taken with a view to this object fail nothing will be undertaken by the Bagdad Railway Company but to undertake the construction of the end of the line. The result of the negotiations to be undertaken with the company can be awaited with tranquillity.

As a result of the present negotiations is, at any rate, the certain prospect of the mighty work of a railway communication from Constantinople to Bagdad, the practical utility of which has so often been doubted and in the way of which so many natural and artificial obstacles have stood, will have been removed.

We shall then with pride be able to look upon a new monument of German industry and persevering German enterprise, which will at the same time benefit to large tracts in Asia Minor and will be a source of revenue to the Ottoman Empire.

11287]

No. 197

Sir G. Barclay to Sir E. Grand (Glasgow) Received March 23, 1911

No. 197

#### RAILWAYS

In continuation of my telegram No. 92 of the 24th March, I have the honour to report that Naar-ul-Mulk's private secretary called on me to-day to suggest confidentially that the Regent, M. Poklewski and myself should discuss a general scheme of railway construction in Persia, unofficially, together. In reply, I informed him that I had received no instructions to discuss railway questions, but I promised that I would telegraph Regent's suggestion to you confidentially.

Please refer to my telegram No. 20 of the 21st March. In

and better palatable to the Persians.

He further stated that he was not instructed to make a similar communication to M. Poklewski. In these circumstances I shall not speak to my Russian colleague until I learn your views on the subject. M. Poklewski knows, however, what passed during the interview granted by the Regent to Mr. Greenway.



10752

TRANSPORT

h January

18 M

many whether in our view they could opportunely appeal. Pecuni

11020

Foreign Office March 27, 1911

Such a statement of your agent

and that of Mr S

W

11096

of March 26)

Sir Arthur

Constantinople, March 16, 1911

I HAVE not troubled you with letters since my return to Constantinople, in the first place because I know how busy you are, and in the second place because I have Ambassador fully informed of anything that has come to my knowledge, and I know was seeing you from time to time.

I have also seen the Grand Vizier and with David Bey on the subject of them that the parties

that their proposals on this point would be unacceptable he said that it would be possible to meet by them by increasing the share for each country from 20 per cent. to 25 per cent., or even more, but that the Germans, he thought, would not be willing to accept any arrangement which would give them a smaller share than any other country. He added that he already noticed a stiffening in the German attitude, in consequence of Sir Edward Grey's full recognition of the rights of the existing concessionaires. I replied that he was hard to please if he complained of Sir Edward Grey's speech, since the statements made were precisely similar to those made by the Grand Vizier in the Turkish Chamber a few days before, and added that Sir Edward Grey had to reckon not only with Germany, but with opinion in England, which had hitherto refused to recognize accomplished facts.

As regards the participations, I am inclined to think that our interests would be fully protected if we had 40 per cent. as against 20 per cent. each for Germany and Turkey. This would give us a majority in combination with any one of the three parties, and would also give us a claim to the chairmanship. If our

of British

argument, but I am inclined to think that its practical importance is often exaggerated. In a customs tariff preferences may no doubt be given in the manner suggested by Mr. Halliday, for instance, cotton yarn of particular counts, or cotton goods of particular

categories, may be taxed at a lower rate. It would hardly be fine distinctions in the case of railway tariffs; for instance, on the Anatolian Railway a 1st class, with a large number of other articles. The great bulk of the Mesopotamian trade is in cotton goods, and I cannot believe that it would be practicable to manipulate railway rates for cotton goods in such a way as to give a preference to one kind of existing trade. Even if minute distinctions between different kinds of cotton goods were made, it would be of little value.

I am not aware that there is any authenticated instance in which the Anatolian Railway discriminates, directly or indirectly, in favour of German goods.

I am very glad to see that the tone of the English press is, on the whole, more reasonable and more conciliatory than it has been in the past. But, even under the most favourable conditions, discussions in the press are likely to prejudice the negotiations. I venture to suggest that the longer the negotiations last the less the prospect of success, and that as rapid a rate of progress as is possible is a matter of real importance.

Conversations have taken place between Bonapart, the Ottoman Bank, and the

on has got so far as has been alleged in the newspapers. The plan, I think, on both sides is to find a means of reopening the French market, and it is thought that

French for relaxing their conditions. As regards the lines on which the money be spent, the Damascus-Sivas line has been suggested, with prolongations to E.

position. The Danube-Adriatic line has also been spoken of, but this

If Anglo-French co-operation in Turkey is to be established, it appears to me that these railway schemes, and in particular the Damascus-Sivas-Hazretum-Yan line, offer suitable grounds for co-operation. There are no established interests on the part of either country, and the field is open. Offers from Sir John Jackson's firm for the construction of these lines, on terms to be negotiated, are

most scheme appears to be making progress. German opposition has been combated—I do not yet know in precisely what manner, and I learn that the German influence has not only ceased to be adverse, but is now used in favour of the scheme. I have little doubt that the

the option. I am much interested in the actual terms of the contract, as regards the conditions and also as regards the trace of the line.

It is, I believe, quite decided that Nazim Pasha, the Vali of Baghdad, is to be recalled. I am sorry for this, for, though he has given trouble by his arbitrary methods, he has certainly not been unfriendly to English interests or to the

Yours, &c.  
H. BALINGTON SMITH

(9933)

No. 201

Government of India to the Earl of Crewe.—(Received at Foreign Office, March 28.)

(Telegraphical)

March 17, 1911

RUMOUR is reported, for what it is worth, by Political Agent, Bahrein, that an attempt is being made to get a lien on Ras Tanura, as a terminus for the Bagdad Railway, is being made by the Germans. It was also stated by Political Agent, informant, a commander of one of the small coasting steamers belonging to British India, that a survey could quite well be made without the knowledge of anyone in Ras Tanura.

13282

Enclosed Copy to Sir F. Bertie

No. 111

Foreign Office, March 28, 1911

I SAW M. Cambon with Sir Arthur Nicolson to-day

M. Cambon informed us that the French Government wished to secure port railway concessions in the north of Asia Minor, which were being applied for by a Russo-French group. They wished to complete the system of Syrian railways, and, as for a part of its length the Hedjaz Railway to be connected with one of the French railways, they wished this length of the Hedjaz Railway to be conceded to the French. Further,

the Danube-Adriatic Railway project in which they were interested. I assumed that, if they were satisfied on these points, they would then be prepared to give their consent to the 4 per cent increase of the Turkish customs dues, and to consider that an agreement had been come to about the Bagdad Railway.

M. Cambon asserted, but said that the consent of the French to the increase would depend upon an accord having been come to

satisfactory arrangement about the Bagdad Gulf section of the Bagdad Railway and would secure for us two things. The first thing was that British trade should be sure of perfectly fair treatment on the whole of the Bagdad Railway system. We could

then would then be a matter in which we should have our say. The second thing we wished to make sure was that the strategic position in the Persian Gulf should not be altered to our disadvantage. We did not wish to press that the Bagdad Railway should be continued to the Persian Gulf, but we wished to secure that if it did reach the Gulf, it should do so at a place and under conditions such that the present strategic position would not be prejudiced. I should discuss these two points with the India Office, which was specially interested in the strategic conditions, and with the Board of Trade, which was interested in the commercial conditions. I should then make a counter-proposal in reply to the Turkish proposals, which would certainly not do as they stood. But, as the Germans could upset any arrangement which was come to with the Turks, I thought we should probably tell the Germans frankly what were the things which we wished to secure, and find out whether they were willing to agree to conditions by which they could be secured. If we found that an agreement could be made, I should tell M. Cambon what the agreement was to be, and I should say to the French that we would not conclude it and give our assent to the customs increase until the French Government also were satisfied on the conditions which he had indicated to me.

M. Cambon entirely accepted this statement of our position.

I am, &c.  
R. GREY

11422

No. 201

Sir G. Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 28.)

No. 7

St. Petersburg, March 28, 1911

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs have sent me an aide-memoire on the subject of the proposed Mohammedan Khorramshah line, of which the following is a summary—

The Russian Government has within the central zone since the two lines might apply for in that zone. I draw attention to the fact that the projected line will lie near the borders of the Russian zone, and that Russian economic interests will therefore be necessarily prejudiced by it. I therefore fear that Russian public opinion will view with disfavour the acquisition of such a concession by Great Britain.

The Russian Government therefore view with pleasure the declaration of His

22



Majesty's Government that at present their only intention is to secure a concession in this line, and that they will enter into a friendly exchange of views with the Russian Government before taking any steps for its construction, in order that all questions connected with the eventual realisation of the enterprise may be settled by agreement between the two Governments.

The Government thank His Majesty's Government for their friendly statement that they have no objection to British capital participating in the construction of railways in Northern Persia.

The *aide-memoire* was forwarded to me by M. Néretow in a private letter, in which it states that from its terms I may conclude that the Russian Government is not in a position to make any concession.

[11080]

No. 204

Sir E. Grey to Sir G. Lowther

(Telegraphic)

Foreign Office, March 28, 1911

THEIR is a parliamentary question on the 29th March, regarding the financial arrangement arrived at respecting the sections of railway between Bagdad and the Persian Gulf, and the nature of compensation which company secures in return for the concession.

I should therefore be pleased if you would telegraph substance of communication promised you by Minister for Foreign Affairs (see your despatch No. 183 of the 19th).

[11438]

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey — Received March 29

(No. 190. Confidential)

Sir,

Persia, March 28, 1911

In continuation of my despatch No. 183, Confidential, of yesterday's date, I have the honour to transmit the text of the declaration made by the Bagdad Railway Company renouncing its rights conditionally to the Bagdad Gulf section and the ports of Basorah and the terminus. This was handed to me today by Rihab Pasha with the assurance that, though not verbatim, it was practically the text, and that there was nothing beyond this. His Excellency, in reply to my enquiry as to a remark to the effect that the Turkish Government had undertaken to keep the German Government fully informed as to the course of the negotiations with the British Government, declared that there was no truth whatever in the statement.

No renunciation of the right to build the port of Bagdad provided for by article 22 of the convention of 1903, appears to have been made on the present occasion, and Rihab Pasha did not know whether it had been the subject of negotiation.

The amount to be paid by the Turkish Government to the Bagdad Railway Company for the construction and working of the Hahf-Bagdad section is £1,000,000, while the surplus receipts assigned by the Government should yield about £1,400,000.

This calculation was, however, based on the returns for one year (1910-11), and I have now had a further calculation made, taking the average results of tithe revenue surpluses for five years, without allowing for almost certain increase, which works out at considerably less in favour of the Government, for, as you will see from the enclosed memorandum instead of there being a slight surplus, there is an apparent insufficiency of £1,200,000. This may have some not inconsiderable interest.

I am, Sir,

GERARD LOWTHER

Enclosure 1 in No. 205

by Bagdad Railway Company

LA Compagnie de Bagdad se desiste de sa concession de 400 à 500 kilom. de chemin de fer, à partir du Golfe Persique, ainsi qu'à sa concession d'un port à Bagdad sur le Golfe Persique, au faveur d'une nouvelle compagnie ottomane.

Bagdad consent à être en garantie vis-à-vis du capital

l'annuité soit égale à celle du capital d'une

concession pour la partie saignée par elle par suite de sa renonciation aux 500 kilom. plus haut mentionnés, et dont la construction est plus facile et moins coûteuse que le restant de la ligne de Bagdad.

Enclosure 2 in No. 205

Statement regarding Payments by the Turkish Government to the Bagdad Railway Company

THE revenues to be set aside for the payment of the annuity of the Hahf-Bagdad section of the Bagdad Railway are, according to article 2 of the text of the new convention published in the "Tamm" of the 29th instant, the following:

1. Government share of the surplus of the ceded revenues, not including the 3 per cent. customs tax.

2. Surplus of the tithe already set aside for the service of the annuity of series I - Konia-Erzurum section.

3. Surplus of the tithe of the district of Konia-Erzurum, amount of kilometre guarantee of the Anatolia line.

The Government share of the surplus of the ceded revenues for the year 1910-11, excluding the customs surtax of 3 per cent., is estimated at £1,000,000 and which may be taken as a basis for calculation.

Surplus of Tithe for first 200 kilom. of Bagdad Railway - Konia-Erzurum Section

The annuity for this section is £1,000,000. To meet it is the Government assigned the following revenue:

To be paid annually out of the tithe of the surplus of Aleppo and Urmia	£1,000,000
From tithe of the surplus of Tebechime, Samarra, and Bagdad	£1,000,000
From tithe of the surplus of Basorah, Karbala, and Musul	£1,000,000
From tithe of the surplus of Bagdad	£1,000,000
From tithe of the surplus of Basorah	£1,000,000
From tithe of the surplus of Karbala	£1,000,000
From tithe of the surplus of Musul	£1,000,000

The annual collection of these revenues since 1905-6 has only once exceeded the annuity, and has never reached the amount estimated by Government. The total encasements

of the annuity

The deficiencies of each year from 1905-6 to 1908-9, were made up from the

It is, however, more than probable that the tithe revenues of the districts mentioned are actually more than the fixed amount shown as the contributions of each





[11579]

(No. 90.)

(Telegraphic) P

RAILWAYS. Reference to your telegram No. 91

Tehran, March 20, 1911

I had believed that if a private British house asked for the concession upon the more favourably received than if it came from His Majesty's Government. The Russian attitude (please refer to my telegram No. 96 of the 27th March) would be more favourable. Furthermore, the success of a private company in this instance might complicate the discussion desired by the Russian Government before the concession is executed.

company, while it may not be less than the Ottoman share, shall be equal to any other Power taking part in the undertaking. As regards the question of compensation for the remuneration of the Bagdad-Gulf section, the Bagdad Company reserves the right of coming to an agreement with the new company.

It is understood that this compensation will take the form of a money payment, that the expense which it is claimed has been incurred by the Bagdad Railway Company in excess of the construction guarantee on the more costly sections of the Komeh Bagdad line shall be thereby made good.

[11573]

No. 207

Sir G. Loder to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 20)

(Confidential.)

Constantinople, March 29, 1911

P. BAGDAD-BUSSORAH Railway

With reference to your telegram No. 73 of the 27th instant, the two routes now selected by Ministry are—

1. The German trace which crosses the Euphrates at El Hadj and proceeds via Kut, following the right bank of that river. This route is the shortest and cheapest. It will carry the Kerbela and Najaf pilgrim traffic, it is, however, not placed for serving the area.

2. A line which follows the right bank of the Tigris as far as Kut and then follows the German trace. This route would run on the embankment which was proposed, and is a little more expensive if constructed after the irrigation works have been carried out, while if constructed before these works it will be necessary to make a bank for the railway. There would result a substantial, though not prohibitive cost. It would, however, as regards the irrigated area, be better than the large river intervention. It would be at a considerable distance from the Kerbela which will benefit by the Hudié barrage, as there be nearer to the Euphrates.

A supplementary system of light railways would probably be required in order to serve the area ultimately to be irrigated in both cases.

As Wilcocks's plans are frequently changing, Sir Henry Babington Smith finds it a decided opinion, but the fact that the German trace is independent is, in his eyes, a great advantage.

11422

No. 208

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Baring

(No. 90.)

(Telegraphic) P

Foreign Office, March 29, 1911

MOHAMMERAH KHOREMAHAD line

Petersburgh telegram No. 74 of the 28th March

Unless you consider such action inopportune at the present juncture, make an application for a concession for a railway from Khor Musa to Khoromahad, option to build a branch to Mohammerah, and for a port at Khor Musa. In view of impending discussions in regard to British participation in Bagdad Railway, it is useful that we should obtain option to build line to Khoromahad as soon as possible, and it therefore appears desirable to make our application before beginning the discussion referred to in your telegram No. 96 of the 27th March. Presumably Russian Minister will ascertain the views of his Government, but there would be no objection, if Russian Government concurs in Regent's proposal, to entering on the joint discussion with Regent respecting a general scheme of railway development immediately after you have made the application.

You should be careful in making application for Khoromahad line to emphasize the fact that all we want in the first instance is an option, and that details can be settled subsequently. I leave it to you to decide whether it would be expedient to refer specifically, in the course of negotiations, to Shah's pledges as to British preferential rights in South Persia.

[1773]

3 A

[11422]

Telegraphic P.

Foreign Office, March 23, 1911

ACTING Minister for Foreign Affairs should be aware that the fact that the

115731

No. 210

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther

Telegraphic P.

Foreign Office, March 23, 1911

NOTE there two places called El Baly on map line 1

War Office are preparing map for Blue Book showing El Baly to be on Tigris about where 34th parallel intersects 44th degree of longitude, but according to your telegram No. 71 it is on the Euphrates.

I have replied previous post on

11021

No. 211

Foreign Office to India Office

Foreign Office, March 23,

WITH reference to your letter of the 18th March relative to a rumour to the

that are on the point of obtaining a loan on the Persian coast

in connection with the proposed railway, and in view of the fact that Sir Edward Grey to transmit to the Ministry copies of telegraphic correspondence exchanged with His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople on the subject.

I am to suggest that an attempt may be made to discover the name of the British agent captain who supplied the information with a view to assist the enquiries of the Ministry conducted at Basorah.

LOUIS MALLAT

11602

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey - Received March 20,

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to

I have, &amp;c

EVELYN GRANT DUFF

Enclosure in No. 212

Extract from the "Pester Lloyd" of March 23, 1911

## KOWEIT

(Translation.)

THE latest apple of discord, with regard to which three of the Great Powers of Europe are interested, in the practical field of Asia is called Koweit, which means in Arabic a small fort. It owes its existence to some adventurous and plundering Arabs, who carried on the locally honoured profession of piracy rather too zealously and were obliged by the Basorah authorities to further attend. According to another account,

\* G. Sir G. Lowther, No. 67, Telegraphic; Sir G. Lowther, No. 68, Telegraphic

which we borrow from one of the Midhat Pasha's memoranda settlers who belonged to the Mateir tribe, came to Koweit from the Hejaz ago, under the leadership of a certain Subah. The family of that leader is still at the head of the population and for this reason the present Sheikh Mubarak is, when called by his full name Mubarak es-Subah. We do not propose to enquire how the former pirate colony became a flourishing port of more than 20,000 inhabitants, who in the absence of arable land, mostly took to commerce and a maritime life. Koweit possesses over 2,000 large and small craft, which carry on trade with Bombay and Zanzibar, and take an important part in the pearl fishery. Strangely enough, the sheikh and his court have a reputation for justice. No one is molested in his territory, or oppressed with special taxes and tribute. Thus, the largest and safest harbour in the Persian Gulf attracted the attention of the western countries and especially England as early as the beginning of last century, at the moment when the English determined to rid the Gulf of the numerous pirates, and thus protect trade with Persia and India. In 1802, Lord Pelly the British resident in the Persian Gulf, visited Koweit and in his official report of 1874 gives us the first insight into the conditions. In the first place he deals with the political position of the Sheikh of Koweit and examines the question of whether his Highness is independent or tributary of Turkey, or whether he is under British protection, as has for some time been the case. This question, naturally, is closely connected with the building of the Baghdad Railway, or, more accurately, with the terminus of that line. The harbour of Koweit is far the best in the whole gulf and therefore the most suitable for commerce with Constantinople, Bagdad, Basorah, and Bombay, while the harbour of Chor Abdullah, on the east coast of Bahrein Island, is smaller and only a fair one.

The superiority of Koweit in this respect is what lends great significance to the whole matter, not only for economic but chiefly for political reasons, which are of vital importance. Without wishing to take sides for one party or the other, it must be admitted that the problem of her future position in the Persian Gulf is, having regard to India, one of paramount importance for England. It need only be observed that the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the Turks under Selim the Magnificent inaugurated and directed their Indian policy from the Persian Gulf. At the present time England could not permit a European Power to occupy a dominating position in the Persian Gulf without thereby tempting it to approach the west coast of India and she must

up her supremacy as regards this point. England in Koweit is not as protector of the independent sheikh, must oppose any aggression. In other words, she can permit no rival Power in the Gulf which, even in the far future might threaten her.

In present conditions there are two Powers which call in question England's position in respect and which are able and desirous of laying claims to Koweit. The first of these Powers is the Ottoman Empire, which, in the first half of the last century, I think in the forties when Naim Pasha was Vali of Bagdad, desired to extend the sheikh of Koweit and annex his territory to the province of Basorah. The scheme then failed. Koweit which up to that time had enjoyed freedom, refused to hear of annexation and customs, and a second attempt during Midhat Pasha's governorship also failed. Since then Koweit has remained a free and independent state, and Turkey has been unable to do anything. The Turkish flag has never been hoisted in Koweit, and the sheikh considered himself, and behaved as, an independent sovereign who only recognised the Sultan in his religious capacity as Caliph. If Turkey now intended to make effect of her right of possession, dating from the time of Sultan Selim, no one could dispute it from the legal point of view. It would, however, be neither wise nor advantageous to quarrel with England on the question, as Koweit has never paid a farthing tribute to the Porte, her debt formerly fell first the Dutch and then the British flag and she would have no more to say to Turkish sovereignty than Noddy, Heligoland, or any of the places on the east coast of Africa. With the Turks England will be able all the more easily to come to an agreement because she has been recently rumoured, the Bagdad Basorah section of the line will be handed over to a special international company, which will of course respect England's treaty with the sheikh without morally injuring the position of Turkey. There remains the second Power, Germany, which, on account of the concession of 1903, feels she has a right to extend the railway south of Bagdad to the shores of the Persian Gulf and is said even to have already taken steps with that end. When the German General Steiner in 1900 was sent with a commission to study the projected railway that commission proceeded as far as Koweit and till quite lately it was thought that Germany would insist on the extension to the Gulf. The news is therefore all the more





11719

No. 210

Sir G. Llewellyn to Sir Edward Grey, (Received March 30.)

## BAGDAD-BUSSORAH Railway

Constantinople March 30 1911

In reply to your telegram No. 80 of the 29th instant, the name El Badi

small canal about 30' wide, above Musayid, which leaves the right bank of the Euphrates 2 or 4 kilom. above the spot chosen for the railway crossing. Evidently

the Euphrates is correctly marked just above Kani Iskenderi on the War Office S.G.S. 2209, November 1907.

122801

No. 211

Memorandum by Mr. Parker

At the meeting which took place this morning it was decided that the reply to the Turkish proposals should be drafted on the following lines:—

The assent of His Majesty's Government to the customs increase shall be given for a fixed period, subject to the following conditions:—

(a) The assent of all other Powers, and especially France and Russia, must be secured to the increase.

(b) A company shall be formed for the line south of Bagdad (of the capital of this company, which shall arrange both for the construction and the working of the line, 50 per cent. shall be British and the remainder German or Turkish).

(c) There shall be two British members on the Board, and the chairman shall, in alternate years, be British.

(d) There shall be no sort of discrimination in freight rates.

(e) Turkey connected with Bagdad.

The British representation on the Board shall always be kept up to a fixed

(f) Fifty per cent. of the capital of the line shall be in the hands of British shareholders.

(g) A right of pre-emption at 5 per cent. shall be given to the Bank of Bagdad, which shall be drawn up by the Board of Trade.

(h) The above arrangements shall not be subject to a commission of inquiry, but shall be continued so long as the enhanced

(i) The port of Koweit, both ashore and afloat, shall be carried in the interests of international trade, by the agents of the Sheikh of Koweit, under

(j) Koweit shall in no circumstances be fortified.

(k) The harbour of Koweit shall be constructed by British contractors, and it shall be built on land to be leased for this purpose by the British Government and controlled by a separate company.

(l) Harbour dues, on a scale to be determined, shall be arranged, and the net proceeds of those dues shall be divided in equal portions between the Sheikh and the

(m) The territorial status quo of Koweit shall be guaranteed by Turkey and Great Britain.

(n) The administration of Koweit shall be carried on in the interests of Turkey.

(o) The administration of Koweit shall be carried on in the interests of Turkey.

(p) The administration of Koweit shall be carried on in the interests of Turkey.

(q) The administration of Koweit shall be carried on in the interests of Turkey.

(r) The administration of Koweit shall be carried on in the interests of Turkey.

(s) The administration of Koweit shall be carried on in the interests of Turkey.

(t) This was, I think, agreed to by the Government of India. It would also indicate the matters relating to the Sheikh's Turkish date properties.

(u) Koweit residents abroad shall enjoy Turkish consular protection.

(v) No fortified base or naval arsenal shall ever be created on the shores of the

(w) The southernmost limit of Turkish jurisdiction in the Persian Gulf shall be 10 miles from the coast of the Persian Gulf south of that

(x) The Ottoman Government shall renounce its claim to the supremacy over any point on the littoral of the Persian Gulf south of that

(y) His Majesty's Government and the Turkish Government shall undertake to recognize the territorial status quo on the littoral of the Persian Gulf.

(z) Subjects of the Sultan shall enjoy British consular protection.

(aa) Subjects of the Sultan shall enjoy British consular protection.

(ab) There shall be no interference with existing buoys and beacons, or with the

(ac) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ad) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ae) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(af) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ag) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ah) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ai) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(aj) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ak) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(al) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(am) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(an) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ao) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ap) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(aq) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ar) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(as) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(at) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(au) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(av) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(aw) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ax) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(ay) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.

(az) Existing restrictions on the borrowing powers of Egypt shall be removed.



it sure that your Lordships' House has not been rather too sparing in initiating debates on matters of high politics, more especially on foreign affairs. I do not think we have

of what I may call the Central Asian question since the debate on the Russian agreement in the beginning of 1908. Any reluctance that may have been felt on our part to initiate discussion has sprung in part from an honourable desire not to embarrass or to challenge

it has also been partly due to the fact

Finance, who very ably represented the Foreign Office, we have never had a representative of the Foreign Office in this House of Parliament. I venture, with all respect, to say that this is a great inconvenience to your Lordships' House, and that on constitutional grounds it represents a most undesirable anomaly. I believe that within the memory of the oldest of

has never been an occasion on which the Foreign Office has not had a spokesman in this House. No doubt that has been largely due to the fact that the Foreign Secretary has usually been a peer, but the accident that the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is in the House of Commons and we do not grudge

once there surely ought not to be made a reason for penning your Lordships' House or for dwelling in any form from that inner knowledge of foreign affairs

representative of the Foreign Office, and to involve the smallest disparagement of his office. We have all of us admired

and grasp with which the leader of this House, Lord Cromer, has on many occasions spoken for departments not his own, spoken for them with an authority and locality that could scarcely have been equalled by a representative of the department itself, and certainly to-night I am the last to complain, because the spokesman for the Government is to be the noble Viscount opposite, who has a peculiar right from his tenure of office in connection with India to speak on every subject about to come. But, after all, no man can speak adequately on a subject on which his knowledge is not acquired outside it. I submit that your Lordships are entitled as a still equal and co-ordinate branch of the

affairs, and I very much regret that among the peers whom the Prime Minister sends up to this House and who adorn the benches opposite there is not to be found a accredited representative of the Foreign Office who can speak to us with the inner knowledge that presence in the Office alone can give. I do not desire to labour the point, and I hope the noble Viscount will pardon the digression I have made, and which has no relevance whatever to his office.

the matter which I have placed on the paper is confined to that part of Asia which is commonly called the Middle East, and it raises questions connected with three portions of those territories—Persia, the Persian Gulf and Turkey in Asia. In all these regions important events have occurred during the past few years, events which, I think,

It apparently separate, are closely connected in their operation and their consequences. In some of these events India has been primarily and directly concerned, in others indirectly, but in the majority of cases they have had relation to the sphere of foreign affairs.

The first subject to which I venture to allude is the condition of Persia. Persia has been passing through troublous times, and to a constitution she has been confronted with financial

crises that have almost threatened disruption of the realm of the country. These symptoms have naturally been viewed with

sympathetic concern, in this country, but in Southern Persia, where the interests of our trade are so important, and where so much British and Indian capital is sunk it is not unnatural that that concern should have assumed a more active and more vivid form. The condition of

in the southern part of Persia, between Isfahan and the sea, and, indeed, in the whole hinterland of the Gulf ports in the latter part of 1910, was one scarcely distinguishable from anarchy. The local Governments almost ceased to exercise their functions, governors were besieged in their houses, at one port Langah, the town was saved from being sacked only by an appeal being addressed to a British naval force to land on the shore, caravans were attacked, the mails were looted, telegraph-wires were cut, trade was paralysed, and bands of lawless tribesmen wandered about the interior doing pretty much what they liked. That, in a few words, is a fair description of the state of affairs about six months or a year ago.

It was in these circumstances that in October last year His Majesty's Government sent a note to the Persian Government indicating to them that unless within the space of three months the security could be re-established on the trade routes the British Government would be called upon to raise a force of militia in Persia itself, which would be commanded by officers from India, where it is easy to

do in that sort of work. At the time this was described in some quarters as a harsh and high-handed proceeding on the part of His Majesty's Government.

It was also described as a proceeding based on sinister designs on the integrity of Persia and the independence of

Persia. I am convinced that such designs were never entertained, and I am confident that the integrity and independence of Persia

is a matter of great importance to the British Government in the present time.

I therefore desire to dissociate myself from those attacks. I believe that our friends in Persia, His Majesty's Government were anxious only to give a warning to the Persian

Government, and to provide a stimulus to the Persian Government to do for themselves what they have to be done for them. At the end of three months

the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

that the situation was still the same, and the British Government was led to believe

next thing that we hear is that a British soldier or an Indian soldier is murdered in India. It is only recently that this trade has attained to really alarming dimensions. I help thinking though in this I am open to correction that His Majesty's Government have been doing their best to suppress it.

More lately, however, and especially during the time the noble Viscount the India Office there has been a great awakening and I have no words to express the satisfaction that has been made by the East India Squadron in the course of the last year.

This took place at a small spot named Debal, on that part of the southern coast of the Persian Gulf which is commonly known as the pirate coast, a name that is given to it by the people before the *pir Britannicus* came on the scene. It was upon this spot that the British frigate was engaged with all the chiefs on this coast.

apparently, was one of the chiefs who signed those treaties. I believe what happened was this, that owing to the great difficulty of exporting arms from Muscat the trade was shifted to Debal. Our naval officers hearing that a consignment of arms was about to be sent there, they went and captured it, and it was then that an unfortunate collision took place. I have heard that an ultimatum was presented to the chief, with which he complied. But two questions which I should like to put to the noble Viscount are these: (1) Was the British frigate implicated in the collision? (2) What was the end of the whole transaction? and (3) Is there any possibility of the trade being broken anywhere else?

Those hearing

British Government

There is no time

My own impression is that we want a special character of vessel of very swift speed and of very small draught, in order to pursue these dhows running before the wind and to catch them as they shoot into the shallows and creeks of the coast.

task, and I believe any special expenditure that was incurred upon that object would be more than repaid in the great saving of life and in the political results that would ensue.

that before I pass from this subject there is another and

to what is the enormous expansion of this illicit traffic

Persian Gulf with the exception of China, has been

trade. The State of Oman alone stands aloof.

how can he tell me as to the cause of this?

at circumstances, but

may eliminate from

now to do with this case. In the case of France, however, there are French subjects

engaged in this traffic at

Muscat, and because of that fact this illustrates the

that I have described, is permitted to continue.

While I was in India the Government at home did their best to induce the French Government to forego its pretensions in this matter. Since then I believe that His Majesty's Government have done the same, and that there have been

one international conference upon the matter. I do not know what progress the negotiations have taken but I believe they have failed in their result, and I have read that if they received territorial compensation elsewhere the French would be prepared to give way. I should be inclined, if I had my right to do so, to make an appeal to the French Government and to the French nation.

have given convincing proofs of the most

prefer to appeal to them, if the appeal is

disregarded for a few years of civility, I

which has exercised a great and

in putting an end to this traffic, I

gated and the port of Muscat were closed to this traffic. It is in the truest sense a matter of life and death to the whole of this traffic, so pernicious in its character, so hard in the privations that it imposes upon our sailors, so dangerous in its effects upon the tribesmen hundreds of miles away upon our Indian frontier, would perish at its source. My Lords, is not this a strong case? May we not

ask the French Government to consider this matter from the wider rather than from the narrow point of view, and to refer to those lofty sentiments which have so often inspired their action in public affairs? I say no more upon that point, and I hope that the few remarks I have made will not be distasteful to the members of His Majesty's Government or to the noble Viscount who is to follow me.

Now I pass from these subjects to one which is, perhaps, more likely to interest the great majority of your Lordships' House. I refer to the questions connected with the Persian Gulf about which the noble Viscount has been kind enough to lay upon the table of the House these standard and illuminating maps, and precisely I refer, of course, to the Bagdad Railway. I need not ask your Lordships to accompany me to the Bagdad Railway. We

all know that recent

this country, that it was first projected by Sir

that as lately as 1872, I think, a Committee of the House of Commons,

the Stafford Northcote, reported in favour of the construction of such a line

means of communication with and as a protection

but since then circumstances have changed, and the entire political position

different. It was about twenty years ago that Germany entered upon that

construction in Asia Minor which was the

of the Turkish Empire, except the Smyrna-Aidin Railway, which still

was a British concern, passing into German hands.

The present situation dates from a more recent period, from the year 1903, when a

Convention was concluded at Constantinople between the Turkish Government and the

of the line from Koniah, in the heart of

on the Persian Gulf

was Secretary of

you will find in

on 1st April, 1903, and the still more famous statement

in this House on the 5th May 1903, a full account of the consideration

the policy of His Majesty's Government at that time. It is quite clear that they took

up no hostile attitude towards the railway. Their financial co-operation was desired by

and they entered into communication with the heads of important

financial houses on the subject. It appears from what passed that His Majesty's

Government did not object in principle to the construction of the line, that they were

willing to agree to an increase in the Turkish Customs Tariff which was necessary in

order to raise the loans required for the construction of the line, and that they

prepared to consider the question of sending the Indian mails by that route, and also

the question of a terminus on the Persian Gulf at Kuwait. They decided, however, that

they were to support the

respect

of management when constructed. It

was not satisfied that His Majesty's Government

from the negotiations into which they had entered

it will be remembered that the Convention was affected to a great extent by the expres-

sions of public opinion in the Press and elsewhere at that time. As soon as the text of

the Convention was published in the "Times" it was never laid as a Parliamentary

paper considerable agitation arose in this country, and for my own part viewing

conditions of the convention, into which I will not enter in detail

in relation to the construction of ports at different points upon the river and in the Gulf,

to the navigation of the river, and the control of the line, it was not surprising that

in consequence of those conditions a good deal of public feeling was aroused. How-

ever that may be, His Majesty's Government decided not to pursue the negotiations.

Whether that was a fortunate or unfortunate decision on their part it is

necessary now to discuss. The only pertinent fact, I think, is that

stances it was inevitable, and it was ratified, as far as I know, not

in, but by all on both sides in politics in this country who were

I am not aware that any criticism was directed against the line



by either side. However, that is a matter of bygone history, and I may pass on to more recent events.

Now, my Lords, what is the present position? As regards railway construction

point which you will see on either of these maps called Bagdadia, a little beyond the southern part of Asia Minor, and there it has halted for the past six but quite recently an inde has been issued for the extension of the line and money I believe has been found for that work. Any one who has been in that part of the world knows that the construction of the most difficult part of the railway is the Taurus Range to cross, and other great

motors. They have the Taurus Range to cross, and other great

This is the moment when talk is heard of reviving negotiations. I have not seen any of the newspapers or of a recent transaction which is alleged to have taken place in Constantinople under which the Bagdad Railway formerly known as the Anatolian Railway, is alleged to have surrendered its

left section, under certain conditions, in return for

from Constantinople, a place on the line a little south of the Taurus Range

Mount Marjay of Blackburn. It is not marked on the

Lord Curzon of Kedleston. In return for the grant of a

important and well known part of Asia Minor. I do not know

if it is all

whole of the trade of Mesopotamia

port. I do not think

the point. What more immediately concerns us is that, if the statements are correct, the price alleged to be paid for this very valuable concession is the of the rights of the company in the left end of the former line. If that is so, my Lords, should it be the desire of His Majesty's Government with the Turkish Government or with any one else in regard

The question which any one would naturally ask is—What are British interests in Bagdad Railway? If we have no substantial interests in the matter, why should

the

In the first place

we interests in every section of that railway from Mesopotamia to the Gulf, and, secondly, political, strategic and

As to the first, over almost the whole of the area covered by the Bagdad Railway, the trade is predominant. We have to see, therefore, that British trade should not be subject to any differential treatment in the future. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said in the House of Commons the other day that the original convention contains satisfactory assurances on that point. I am not quite clear as to that. A mere clause in the statutes of the company prohibiting differential rates may be a very good one in itself, but it would be comparatively easy to make a tariff levying entourage of goods which come mainly from Germany, as opposed to goods coming

many of your Lordships, and I believe there are clauses in the "cahier des charges" of the

roads of another. Therefore I am a little suspicious on the matter, and I am it in order to say that I hope His Majesty's Government will be alive to this aspect of the matter. The money which is required can only be procured by their consent and I that consent will not be given unless they are assured that our commercial interests will be protected over the whole of this area from the hostile and differential treatment which I have never had as not impossible.

There is one branch of the projected railway about which I am not altogether to be made from Bagdadi, just north of Bagdad, to

I know that this concession was part of the

ways been contemplated that when the railway

be constructed with a line opening

itself. That is a matter with which we have a close concern. British goods coming up the Gulf in ships are sent up to Bagdad in boats, and then put on the backs of mules and ponies and carried over the mountains into Persia. This is a business amounting to 1,000,000 a year, while the whole trade of the other nations of is not much more than one-tenth of that sum.

What is to happen to that trade in the future? I think that up to Bagdad and up to Bagdad by the river routes it will hold its own. As to what will happen on the middle section between Bagdad and Khankin I am not quite sure. I have a shrewd suspicion that when the Russian railway is completed, the whole of the trade of northern and central Persia, in so far as it goes by the customary caravan routes to the southern ports, will be diverted to the if that be so, the prospect for British trade is one which we cannot help

I hope His Majesty's Government will keep an open eye

as to opportunity of securing that fair

that route entitles

treatment which the

as to demand.

In the debate in the House of Commons on this subject Sir Edward Grey said that if we want to combat this

for the Opposition to make suggestions.

they are the custodians of our interests

ated with the facts, and it is for them to put pressure on at the

at likely to be successful. I do not want to press the matter

I want to make any suggestion, but I should like to ask

their Sir Edward Grey's statement was merely a platonic enunciation of a general principle or whether it did point to

My Lords

Your Lordships know well that some years ago the

to cement an autograph promise from the then Shah

that any Russian railway concession in the north of Persia

ing British railway concession in the south. That promise has been quoted

order by Lord Lansdowne in this House, and it has been repeated by

Government. It seems to me, therefore, that if a Russian railway

th leading down to Khankin, the time is drawing near

his pledge in the south, and I should like to know that

at being right of this question and that when the

hour arrives they will be of the opportunity thus created

unless the noble Viscount is

My Lords, I said just now that our interests in the eastern end of the Bagdad

Railway are political and strategic, and the proposition which I would submit is that

these considerations start into being the moment we leave Bagdad. It would be a

mistake to suppose that our political interests are confined to the Gulf. They are

confined to the Gulf, they are not confined to the region between the

Bagdad they are not confined to the region between Bagdad and Bagdad, they

over the whole region right away up to Bagdad. The navigation of the

Bagdad has been for scores of years in the hands of a British company

entirely equipped, I fear in recent years, but still holding its own. We have

relations with the Arab chieftains on the banks of the river not in Turkish territory

Nearly 90 per cent of the trade that goes up to Bagdad is British and Indian

Large numbers of Indian subjects visit and live in the holy shrines of Kerbala and

Najaf, and a constant stream of emigration runs between India and these places. In

Bagdad itself we had a resident 100 years ago—eighty years before the existence

of any other foreign Power appeared on the scene. There he has been

with a gun boat and an Indian guard. Those evidences, which I might multiply, are

sufficient to show that we exercise an influence in this portion of the territory at the

end of the Gulf that entitles us to consideration and consultation in any question

raised in connection with that end of the Bagdad Railway.

I am not called upon to discuss the treaty relations that exist between ourselves

and the Sheikh of Kuwait. As the Viceroy who negotiated that treaty I might have

something to say on the subject but I will merely say that, with all respect to the

claims and pretensions of other Powers, our position cannot be ignored, and I am sure

that His Majesty's Government, from what the Secretary of State for Foreign

Affairs said the other day, may be relied upon not to surrender the advantages which

we enjoy

Our position in the Gulf however depends on very much more than on any

treaties we may have concluded with individual chiefs. It rests upon the unassailable

ground of our trade in the Gulf, upon our services there for the last 100 years; upon

3 D

[1773]

the capital sunk, upon the naval position we keep up upon the political predominance which we maintain, and most of all, upon the fact that the Gulf is part of the maritime frontier of India, and that in the politics of the Gulf are involved the security, integrity and peace of India itself. This is no new discovery, but an admitted truism accepted by all parties on both sides in both Houses of Parliament. It has been emphatically stated over and over again in both Houses. There was the famous statement of Lord Lansdowne, to which I have referred in this House, there was the earlier statement by the noble Marquess who sits below me, Lord Salisbury, there have been more than one statement by Sir Edward Grey; and I have here a statement made by the late Sir Charles Dilke which I should like to quote as emanating from a man who disagreed with the views of many of those who sit in this House but speaking in the House of

Commons. "Our Government must not only maintain not only our privileged but our honorable position in the Persian Gulf."

I need not labour the point. It is a fundamental principle of British policy that we cannot allow the growth of any rival or predominant political interest in the waters of the Gulf not because it would affect our local prestige alone but because it would have influences that would extend far many thousands of miles. I venture to think that the assertion of this principle even in its most extreme form is not, and need not be, antagonistic to the interests of any other Power of the world. I imagine that it would be frankly accepted by all those who have knowledge that it has ever been disputed by any Power. The recognition of the sovereignty of Turkey in those parts of the upper end of the Gulf and to the district between Fao and Basra, and the consequent power, to keep in check the unruly tribes on the bank of the Delta, is an object that ought to be one not merely of anxious solicitude of paramount necessity to a British Government. I can imagine nothing that is essential to conceive than a strong Turkish Government in those regions and sure that this House would commend any steps taken to fortify the British Government in that quarter, and that whether we

remain or in our present position that is likely to be detrimental to the success of any such negotiations.

My Lords, quite frankly if I were to speak this afternoon as an individual of danger. I am not clear that it would benefit our trade, it might conceivably do so. I have never convinced myself that it is desirable to continue the building of a railway beyond Bagdad, and certainly if a railway be there constructed, the trade from Basra to the Gulf, which is the interest on it.

Now the contrary points well. But if in spite of these considerations a decision is resolved on the building of the railway in so far as it is a railway, and if the railway can be built without serious financial risk, then I think His Majesty's Government are entirely entitled and are bound to enter into a discussion with them in a reasonable spirit with a view it may be to

Sir Edward Grey said in the House of Commons ten days ago that we possess certain advantages in a discussion with Turkey. He pointed out that the increase of the customs duties which the Turkish Government are seeking cannot be without our consent. He pointed out the position of vantage which

enjoy at Koweit and the upper end of the Gulf. I agree with all he said, but, if anything, he understated rather than overstated our position. My belief is that the whole of the Bagdad Railway, from sea to sea, from the Mediterranean to the Gulf cannot be built without access to the financial markets of Great Britain and France, and it is only by international co-operation between the various Great Powers concerned that the requisite security for the investment can be obtained. I doubt if it can be

Power alone, or if remunerative profits can be secured unless more than one Power is concerned. There are also great schemes for the development and irrigation of other parts of the country, of Chaldean and of Mesopotamia. Every one of us would like to see these projects translated into effect

where the population is to come from to till the ground thus recovered and to revive the vanished glories of the past. Believe me my Lords, there is a very long throw to be made before the end is in sight. I do not make these remarks in the slightest degree to depreciate or deprecate the scheme, but I do utter them from some slight knowledge of the facts in order to modify the exaggerated anticipations entertained in many quarters and to indicate more strongly than anything else that without British support is more than doubtful if any of these schemes will see the light of fruition. It is not

thinks of construction or control that might have to be done were built. Many plans are discussed in the course of an international system, with its costly

His Majesty's Government may have their own views about the matter. I do not presume to dictate to them. My own position is simply that, whatever method of construction of the Gulf section is adopted, they will see that the predominance of our interests is maintained, and that no method of construction of the Gulf section will be adopted which will tend to impair or whittle away or derogate from the rights which I have described.

I now conclude there is one subject about which I shall say little, because I know

out which it is impossible to be altogether silent. I allude to the alleged

Russian and German entered upon, if not concluded, at Potsdam in

and they are all incorrect, but we have certain

aid by the German Chancellor, speaking at

and by M. Sazonoff, the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, speaking at

St. Petersburg, and from those utterances I think we are justified in believing, first, that when the German railway from Bagdad reaches Karkun, on the frontier of Persia, the Russians are prepared to build a railway from Tehran or its neighbourhood down to the frontier to meet it, and secondly, that the Russians have withdrawn the opposition

which at one time was strong on their part to the construction of the Bagdad Railway

of which, of course, are great advantages to Germany, and on the

general prearrangement in the northern part of Persia, which, of

course, is an equal gain to Russia. It would be idle to deny that this version of

affairs, if it be true, has excited some apprehension, and that there are many who have

such impending in that extent between Russia and

Anglo-Russian agreement concluded by

ords opposed a few years ago, and for which, as many of us think, they paid a

very high price in that agreement, but to which at any rate, nobody can say that this

country has not loyally and unflinchingly adhered.

It would be a great relief to us if His Majesty's Government could say, without

knowledge and sympathy, that our undertaking with Russia has not been in any degree

that our interests have not suffered and are not likely to suffer. I should be

glad to know that our international policy or the grouping of allied Powers

is compatible with friendly arrangements between members of the different groups

of subjects that more specially concern themselves. Every such agreement may be

and ought to be, a link in the international chain of peace, but of course it ought to

be subject to the condition that these minor accommodations are carried out with perfect

loyalty to the larger issues that are concerned, as I doubt not has been the case in the

present instance, and that private interests are never allowed to get the better of public

obligations. I do not venture to say more on the point, and I hope that I have not said

too much.

There is only one other subject to which I desire to allude, and it is this. In the

course of the discussion on all these questions there has again emerged, after long



oblivion, the idea of a great trans-Persian line, running either from Trebizond, in the corner of the Black Sea, via Tabreez to Tehran, or from the Caspian Sea to Tehran, and then continuing via Yazd and Kerman in a south-easterly direction to the eastern frontier. Whenever such a scheme is proposed it fills the imagination of those who regard it, because it is part of that great scheme of international politics which, in the belief of all of us, will some day be carried out.

where only a gap of a few hundred miles. He will also agree with me that which I need not enter, such a line is outside the sphere of practical politics, events at present. Nor do I need to enter into an examination of the features of the trans-Persian line. Many important issues are involved in that examination. I am aware that experts entertain most widely different opinions on the subject. I mention it only because I have seen it stated that the Russian Government have indicated a willingness to support the scheme if it is carried out without injuring Russian commercial interests and without imposing fresh burdens upon the Russian people.

and of these 'ifs' is a very big 'if'. I have never been able myself to imagine the funds are going to come from for these great trans-continental schemes, and elsewhere. Obviously, no country will find the money unless it has a guarantee by some Government. There are only three Governments concerned. The first is the Government of Persia, which is unhappily not in a position to give a guarantee to anybody. The second is the Government of Russia, whose attitude I have already described. The third is the Government of this country, and I confess I do not see the Chancellor of the Exchequer coming down to the House of Commons and making a request to Parliament to guarantee Government funds for this line. And then, another condition has to be satisfied before such an idea is entertained, and that is that there is a sound and stable Government in the country through which the line runs. I will not pursue the subject. I have merely

mentioned whether the idea is at all seriously entertained, regard it as occupying any place in the field of international politics at the present time.

My motion ends with a request for papers. Really I ought to thank the noble Viscount for having so far anticipated me as to overwhelm me with these admirable and useful maps, but when I talked about papers I meant something more than maps. The fact is that the Governments in recent years have been rather parsimonious in distribution of papers on Asiatic matters. I believe that as regards Persia the last Blue Book we have is Persian No. 1, 1910, which covers events up to the end of 1910.

But about the Persian Gulf, so far as I know, we have had nothing of the proceedings at Brussels to which I have referred.

In any case, we have never had a full report of the proceedings at Brussels, and if you want to know the truth, or else to the last

the contract is a modern Government.

fully ask the noble Viscount to present us with all the papers that he reasonably can. I have

nothing more to say.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

The noble Lord has taken us on to an important ground as, I think, any member of your Lordships' House could undertake. People do not yet recognise how enormous are the issues involved, how enormous in the area involved in the questions which the noble Lord has raised, and nobody in this House has a better right to hold discussions upon these questions than the noble Lord. He has been most part of his life, I should think, closely interested in the whole group of questions that he has dealt with this afternoon, and his knowledge to within six years ago is first-hand and personal knowledge. I do not for a moment dispute his claim that he has discussed all these questions, large and important as they are, in a perfectly honest and

and sincere spirit. We have no possible ground for complaint. I think the noble Lord is very ungrateful in his irony about the maps, because really when he last spoke on these issues in 1908 he said how he regretted that there were no maps, and that without maps the discussion was unintelligible. I therefore thought that in providing maps I was meeting the noble Lord's views.

The noble Lord mentioned at the end of his speech what are called the Potsdam negotiations, if that is the right word, between Russia and Germany. I know better than the noble Lord that for us at this stage to discuss negotiations between two sovereign independent Powers before those negotiations, so far as we know, have come to a definite conclusion would be to take up a position which an official or responsible person, either in this House or the country, has no right to take. Therefore I have nothing to say about what are called the Potsdam

With regard to the subject of trans-Persian railways, any ideas or designs on sensible or useful, or instructive observations feel very much interested.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the interest you have taken in my motion.

was meant to provide them with a stimulus. The noble Lord asks as to the present situation on the southern route. It was impossible to say, in view of the social conditions that obtained there, that any immediate restoration to order was possible, but it is the fact that the position there is greatly improved, whether that is due as some say, to the severity of the weather or other causes we do not know, but we are watching with patience and with hope.

The noble Lord made reference to Persian railways, and alluded to the fact that this is a very important document, and discussing railway construction in Persia, it will be found that the Shah, in this autograph letter, says—

“Convey these commands to his Excellency the British Minister Plenipotentiary. Even give him this very autograph in order that he may keep it as a memento of our former promise with regard to the Persian railways.”

over others in the construction of a southern railway holds good. Certainly, whenever railway concessions in the north, &c., are given to others immediately a concession for a railway from Tehran to Shuster, or such a one, will be given to the English company; and, of course, then the clauses and conditions will also be examined, in order that it be to our advantage and interest for the benefit of commerce of both parties; and positively no southern railway without consultation with the British Government.

These explicit assurances were once more confirmed in the year 1900.

His Majesty's Government cannot conceal from themselves that the question of railway construction in Persia may involve important strategic considerations, but provided that these and other considerations are satisfied by an adequate British participation in the railway schemes which may be adopted by the Persian Government, then His Majesty's Government would not construe their preferential rights in any narrow or exclusive manner.

I turn to the Persian Gulf, which the noble Lord knows a great deal about from his own experience.

Although Great Britain has not sought territorial acquisition in those regions, she has for generations borne burdens there which no other nation has ever undertaken anywhere except in the capacity of Sovereign. She has been thrust upon her without dominion. She has kept the peace amongst peoples who are not her subjects, has patrolled, during upwards of two centuries, waters over which she has enjoyed no formal lordship, has kept, in strange ports, an open door through which the traders of every nation might pass, has given a free access to distant markets as her own. If Great Britain has been in any sense, the arbiter and guardian of the Gulf it has not been through a restless ambition urging her on to the control of the waste places of the world, but through the sense of duty that has been made upon her in the past to enforce peace between warring tribes, to give a free course to trade, to hold back the arm of the marauder and oppressor, to stand between the slaveholder and his victim.

The noble Lord refers to the fact that the world, and to this day, the world exists.

It is only understood, that we adhere to the position taken up, and expressed, I think, in this House by Lord Lansdowne in 1903. That at all events ought to be satisfactory.

The noble Lord next referred to Mesopotamia. Mesopotamia, as your Lordships know, is a region of which to us in India and to people in the Gulf are well known to your Lordships. The noble Lord, after all, put his finger upon the real crux of the

situation, though I am not quite sure that he appreciated how great the difficulty is. It is in error when he says that it is the French who are the manufacturers of the trouble. The French are the manufacturers of the trouble.

made a powerful appeal upon the treaties with the Sultan of Muscat. He made a passionate appeal to France to look at this thing in the light of those great ideas and splendid moral impulses which have enabled France for generations to play so great a part in the civilisation of the western world.

Every word of the noble Lord's appeal will, I am sure, touch the French, but it must be remembered that France has treaty rights. Can we expect a country to surrender treaty rights affecting some portion of her own community without getting something in return? My knowledge of international history does not provide me with any case in our modern times where there has been such a surrender without some consideration. It is clear that we are engaged in pressing the difficulties which they create for us.

their treaty rights. I am not sure that the noble Lord's reference to the dispatch of the squadron upon which he commented, the squadron which doubled between 1906 and 1908, has fallen in value. Since we set foot a naval blockade, the value of arms imported into Muscat has fallen from 237,000l. in 1906 to 103,000l. in 1909, and it will be found to have fallen still further in 1910. The value of the French arms is less than one-tenth of that total. We hope, however, that the French Government will be impressed by the statements which are made to them and that good results will follow. As to the question raised by the noble Lord as to the precise type of war-ship now employed in the right machinery for this traffic, I can express no opinion, but I dare say it is worth

considered with regard to the situation. The noble Lord is quite mistaken if he thinks we are not doing our best. The noble Lord referred to the case sent at Dubai, that, considering the great size of the other questions raised by him, this was rather diminutive. The facts are these. The Arabs fired on a party who went to search for arms—a party from one of His Majesty's ships. A general engagement ensued, in which we had five killed and nine wounded, and the enemy thirty-seven wounded. The attack, though invited to meet the British commander and assist in the search, reply, and only appeared after trouble had begun. He then took measures to capture the British resident and the admiral at once proceeded to Dubai and the attack. His attitude being unsatisfactory, a written ultimatum was presented to him, and forty-eight hours were given him in which to comply with the terms. He accepted these terms on the 30th December.

of India reported that the road now in place a trivial incident of that kind has in so large a scale. The policy as the noble Lord has given us. The incident at Dubai was a local one, but I was concerned to ask whether this rupture of the treaty by the importation of arms was an isolated instance at Dubai, or whether there was anything like a general return to piratical and marauding ways in that region. I think that it extended to other parts of the coast, because if so the trouble would be serious.

The noble Lord refers to the case of the Blackburn. I cannot say with absolute certainty that there was nothing at all, or was not when I left the India Office, to lead us to suppose there was anything like a general return to piratical and marauding ways in that region.

I come now to the Bagdad Railway. The noble Lord has presented quite truly and fairly to the House all the elements which make what is called the question of the Bagdad Railway. I agree with him in extending the question to the whole of the region.

The noble Lord made what was a very good statement. I am not sure, however, but I do not agree with him in his history of our dealings with this question. I am sure that the Turkish Government should desire to have the Bagdad Railway completed. I dare say the noble Lord is right in saying that Turkish forces in 1909, and was



then fascinated with the idea of what could be done on the banks of the Euphrates effect on the German imagination ever since. At any rate since 1873 the Germans have taken a practical and an increasing part in the construction of railways in Asia Turkey. In 1873 the first section of what is now known as the Anatolian Railway was built by a German engineer, von Plessel, to the order of the Turkish Government and in 1886 it was transferred to a German company. Subsequently that line was extended to Konia. Three years later a concession was granted to a German syndicate for the extension of the line to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf, and after undergoing various modifications this concession for the Bagdad Railway assumed its final shape in 1903.

The noble Lord rather got on to dangerous ground if he is anxious to avoid anything in the nature of a controversy, as I am sure he is, when he referred to the action taken by His Majesty's Government in 1903 when Lord Lansdowne was Foreign Secretary. I think he forgets that whatever extension there may be for as I think the misjudgment that was made in 1903 when the British Government refused to grant the Bagdad Railway, at all events that action, however you explain or extenuate it, has not been justified by events. I well remember the activity of certain organs of public opinion at that date, but I do not believe any of those who inspired, as I think, that rather unhappy decision would say to-day that it would not have been far better as events have proved if we had in 1903 acceded to the Bagdad Railway. I do not say the noble Lord endeavoured to bring about the position in which any British Government.

Even at the date when the Bagdad Railway concession was granted the position, as they were working, about 650 miles, they began to get concessions for this larger and more important line. The noble Lord said the decision at that date on our part was to refuse. But let it pass. I would not have said that the noble Lord endeavoured to vindicate Mr. Balfour's action from a charge which certainly has not been made here. It was this which made it necessary for me to point out that the decision of that day has not been justified by events.

What is the present position? The position as we found it in December 1905, when we assumed office, was that a concession for the Bagdad Railway to run from Konia to the Persian Gulf had been granted years before, and that the concession was not merely for the main line, but also for many branch lines, of which, perhaps, the most important is the line on which the noble Lord expatiated, from Bagdad to Khandak on the Turkish frontier. The Government were in the situation, it is no use denying it, the Germans were in the position of *de facto* predominance; they held under an international agreement for a number of years. A great deal of nonsense is talked about the possible danger. I do not refer to the inferior possibilities to British interests which may be involved some day or other when this railway is completed, and there have been whimsical apprehensions expressed. One is that it will constitute a danger to our position in the East. Another is that because the argument is that, by a direct line with the Bagdad line, which will

argument to the effect that the noble Lord overlooks the fact that the Bagdad line

at over a million sterling passed by carriage

the concession was granted, not after. You cannot get over the fact, that this railway is made on Turkish territory by virtue of an act granted by the Turkish Government. You cannot get over that fact, that as it stands. I see articles in newspapers every day in which it is assumed that we have the right there to do what we please—that is not so, it is not our soil, it is Turkish soil, and the Germans alone are there because the Turkish Government have given them the right to be there. Let us, therefore, start with a view of the situation from that plain and simple fact.

The noble Lord has referred to the "cahier des charges," which I propose to lay before Parliament. It is really a schedule, and it is said it might be worked to our disadvantage. Remarks made by Mr. Balfour in another place pointed in this direction. That, again, is attached to the convention of 1903, and it does not appear from the fact that the Ottoman Government or the railway company contemplate the introduction of duties against British goods either on the main line or on the branch to Khandak. But His Majesty's Government realise as fully as any member of the House that British trade interests in these regions are of great importance.

I go so far with the noble Lord as to say that the "cahier des charges" is not a completely objectionable stipulation of a "cahier des charges" to the construction of any railway in the territory, but they cannot directly or indirectly facilitate the construction of railways if their completion is to alter the existing position in Mesopotamia to the detriment of British interests and to the exclusion of British participation on reasonable terms. It is undeniable that His Majesty's Government are in principle favourable to the construction of railways in Turkey, they appreciate how important this construction is for other purposes, for the consolidation of the new regime, and the new regime in Mesopotamia we cordially wish will continue and prosper. If therefore, we could

without his permission, but the principal objection to the Bagdad Railway is the Turkish customs duties, which are, of course, the

Now I come to the various arrangements to which the noble Lord referred in the 1903 concession the Bagdad Railway Company had acquired a right to build a line from Konia to some point on the Persian Gulf to be determined hereafter by the company acquired duties in Mesopotamia.

On the other hand, in fullment of the terms of the 1903 concession the Bagdad company have come to an arrangement whereby, first, a branch line is to be built from Khandak on the main line to Akko on the Gulf of that sea, and have provided that certain revenues are allocated to them in accordance with the original concession of 1903 for the continuance of their main line from Konia to Bagdad.

The upshot of this arrangement is that within certain limitations the Government have regained their liberty of action in regard to the section of the railway from Khandak to Akko. The arrangements which have been made to His Majesty's Government are in a very early stage, but we wish it to be clearly understood that His Majesty's Government sincerely desire a settlement that will remove all anxiety as to the important British trade interests concerned, and at the same time the minds of suspicion and distrust that have so often obscured the issue in short, that will remove all apprehension that the Bagdad Railway is likely to create diplomatic friction between any two countries.

We feel that any arrangement must be one to which the Government party, as the original concession-holders were Germans. The present position in affairs stands at the present moment. As noble Lords will understand, we cannot, without prejudice to negotiations which will naturally follow these arrangements that there is a marked step in a favourable direction, promising development.

Government will be animated by the desire to remove all possible cause for international friction, and, your Lordships may be very sure, to uphold all the important interests, past and future, of this country.

have detained the House so long that if the noble Lord will excuse me I will not pursue the minor points he has raised. I for one stand with pleasure at the expression of his own large, well-supported views on the issue of this new chapter opening in the relations between Europe and Asia. Here is no Alexander



going from Europe to Asia—it is a very different thing you have to think of; here are great rival international interests, and a great movement more difficult to adjust in all its elements. It is not merely military; the military and strategic aspects are among a whole congeries of elements that go towards the complication of questions of enormous importance both to the political and commercial future of this country, and therefore to the world.

As to the motion for papers, I will undertake to lay before the House further correspondence on Persia, the text of the Bagdad Railway Convention of 1903, and the supplementary convention of 1908, the "cahier des charges," and the loan contracts. The noble Lord asked for the Brussels Convention, and I will see whether it can be given.

Lord Lamington.—My Lords, no one can deny how vast, delicate, and intricate are the interests involved in the various questions that have been brought before your Lordships' House by Lord Curzon to-day. On the 7th February last, I put a question to the noble Viscount relative to the Potsdam interview. He then said that he was unable to give any information, but I should have thought that by this time it might have been possible to throw some light on the negotiations which took place there.

In opening this debate Lord Curzon drew a picture of the great disorder that has taken place in the southern portion of Persia. On that I rather agree with the noble Viscount opposite that Lord Curzon over-coloured the picture. It must be remembered that in the five months subsequent to last March the trade of the southern ports increased by 86 per cent. as a whole, and that even at Bushire there was a 22 per cent. increase during those five months, and that is the part of the country most liable to interruption owing to brigandage and general misgovernment. At the present time when any ordinary robbery takes place it is at once put down to the Government. An instance was related to me of the agent of a firm who had embezzled money. A little plan was concocted, and it was represented that the currency had been robbed, and this again was laid to the charge of the Government. It may be argued that if the country is so weakly governed that these accusations can be made, therefore there ought to be some stronger hand to guide their affairs. But how has it come about that there has been this great misgovernment and disorder in Persia?

The noble Viscount took great credit for the carrying out of the Anglo-Russian convention, which distinctly stated in the preamble that the integrity of Persia was to be preserved. But how can you preserve the independence of a country when it has in certain portions been largely garrisoned by foreign troops? Time after time with an empty exchequer Persia has attempted to get funds for carrying on the administration of the country, but has been thwarted in her efforts. The Nationalist Government have not been allowed a free hand to put their affairs on a proper basis. They could not do so without having funds at their command, and these funds have been repeatedly denied them. We now understand that the Russian garrison at Kazvin is to be removed, or possibly only reduced. I understand that about seventy men are still being kept there. I would like to know whether the other garrisons are being removed. Again, the Persian Government in their struggling condition have had their Minister of Finance assassinated, and his murderers were given protection by the Russian consulate or the Russian legation and were removed for trial to Russia. We would like to know what has been done with those people. An attempt was made to assassinate the Governor of Isfahan, and his nephew was killed in his efforts to protect him. There, again, the murderers were taken charge of by the Russian Government.

I quote these instances not to make any case against Russia, but to show what frightful odds the Persian Government have had to contend with. How can a Government control their subjects when they are denied the means by which alone good government can be carried on? It is either hard to accuse the new-born Persian Government of having failed to preserve order in that very difficult country of access in Southern Persia when they have not been given a free hand. I believe honestly that they have done their best, and that if they had only been given a greater command of funds they would have been able to preserve order. It will be remembered that we stated that if we had to take charge of the police force on the Persian Gulf we should demand a surtax of 10 per cent. on the customs duties. I cannot see why the Persian Government themselves should not have been allowed to raise that 10 per cent. and administer the country properly. Why should we be so suspicious of their ability to administer properly funds entrusted to them? It is this which makes it so difficult for the Persian Government to carry on their affairs in a proper manner.

I understand from other sources that there is possibly a brighter day dawning for the Persian Government, and that there is a possibility now of their being allowed to

obtain loans by which to carry on their administration. I believe they are going to appoint five American advisers to superintend their financial affairs. All these are good auguries for the future of the country, and under the guidance of the Regent I believe there is a possibility of the salvation of Persia. If only they would sink their own petty differences and set up to the doctrines of their own Islamic creed, I do believe there would be an independent Persia established which would be the best possible bulwark against any friction between Russia and ourselves. On the point of gun-running in the Persian Gulf, Lord Curzon made a fine and dignified appeal to the French nation, but the noble Viscount opposite rather let him down when he asked what instance there was of a country ever giving up an advantage without a *quid pro quo*.

Viscount Morley of Blackburn.—Giving up treaty rights.

Lord Lamington.—But if treaty rights are an infringement of the ordinary laws of civilisation, surely it is not too much to expect one of the foremost civilised countries to co-operate in putting an end to this traffic. The noble Lord referred to Muscat. He might have referred also to Zibuti, which, I understand, is the very centre of this traffic in the distribution of arms. Time after time we have attempted to negotiate with the French nation on this matter, and I should have thought that this was a very opportune occasion, the *entente cordiale* being so firmly established, when we might represent to them strongly that the whole of this gun-running traffic should, if possible, be put an end to. Only last week there was an attack on the coast between an armed dhow of our own and a dhow engaged in running arms. That dhow came from Zibuti. There are no treaty rights there, and there is no reason why, with the assistance of the French nation, an end could not be put to the whole of this trade.

The statement which the noble Viscount made with regard to the Bagdad Railway I regard as very satisfactory. Our chief concern is with the section from Bagdad to the Gulf; and if the German company have now got the branch down to Alexandretta, I should have thought there was every occasion for our now establishing good relations with the Germans in regard to this matter. Our one concern is, as I have said, in respect of the last section from Bagdad to the Gulf. One would like to know the views of His Majesty's Government on this matter, whether they consider that that section should ever be built, or whether our trade would not be benefited at a far less cost by simply improving the navigation of the Tigris. That, at all events for many years to come, would carry all the trade, represented by 1,000,000*l.* per annum in value, that would go by that route. This seems a favourable opportunity not only to extend friendship with Russia, but also to put our own relations with Germany on a good footing in this matter. If we have a proper share of that last section to the Gulf, I do not think we need ask for any more, except that the extension from Bagdad to Khandkin should be safeguarded so that there are no unfavourable rates by which our trade could be injured. I hope that this debate will put the whole of the questions that have been raised by the noble Lord on a clearer and better footing, and that we shall thereby establish better relations in that part of the world.

The Marquess of Salisbury.—My Lords, I do not think it would be quite fitting that we should allow the very important statement which the noble Viscount has made to your Lordships to pass without any comment from those who formed part of the late Government in respect to what they had to do in relation to the matters upon which the noble Viscount dwelt. I speak with a full sense of the great difficulty of dealing with these delicate subjects of foreign policy in public debate, and perhaps it would not have been necessary for me to say a word at all upon the subject but for the fact that the noble Viscount appeared to me to be desirous of defending the very important step in policy which His Majesty's Government are evidently undertaking by throwing a certain responsibility for the situation upon the predecessors of the present Government. There was a sort of covered attack by the noble Viscount upon the attitude which we adopted in respect to the Bagdad Railway.

Viscount Morley of Blackburn.—It was raised by the noble Lord or I should not have mentioned it.

The Marquess of Salisbury.—I do not agree with the noble Viscount. My noble friend, Lord Curzon, spoke, as I thought, in very proper terms, of the attitude which we had adopted in respect of the Bagdad Railway in former times. There was no call for the noble Viscount to have brought our conduct into question, unless it be necessary in order to defend his own policy that he should reflect adversely upon ours. I do not desire to treat this subject in any aggressive spirit, but I think it necessary to place upon record what, in fact, the late Government did.

Now, what did the late Government do? The noble Viscount, not quite correctly, spoke as if we had refused to come to an arrangement about the Bagdad Railway.



That was not an absolutely correct statement of the case, because as a matter of fact the persons who refused to come to an arrangement were the members of the financial groups concerned. Undoubtedly they were in close relations with the then Government all through the negotiations, and the matter we had to decide was whether British interests were properly treated in the arrangements that were proposed on behalf of the German group. That was the question. It was stated by my noble friend, Lord Lansdowne, at the time, and these are the words he used:—

"What was under our consideration was the possibility of obtaining the substitution for this purely German system of a line of an international character, constructed under guarantees which would have secured permanently its international character, and which would have secured for the commerce of all nations absolutely free and equal treatment from sea to sea."

The noble Marquess went on to say:—

"It was also part of the proposals which were ventilated that this country should be given full equality with any other Power in respect of the construction of the line, and in respect of its maintenance and control after it had been constructed."

That was the ideal which His Majesty's then Government were favourable to. That was the proposal which was not offered to us, and therefore it was not possible for the then Government to support and endorse the arrangement which was made.

The noble Viscount thinks that we were wrong in the decision we came to. That is a matter only of historical interest. The noble Viscount may be right, and we may have been wrong. All I say is that we acted according to the best of our ability, and according to what, in our judgment, were the interests of our country. I gather that the noble Viscount and his colleagues do not view the matter from precisely the same point of view. I touch on this subject with great diffidence, but certainly the sort of outline which the noble Viscount gave of the proposals which are under the consideration of the Government did not seem to place our country on a precisely equal footing with that of other countries. He divided, very properly, the Bagdad Railway into two divisions—the Gulf section and the rest. I think it is possible that the sort of arrangement which His Majesty's Government are contemplating is that the greater part of the Bagdad Railway should be made without any positive position being accorded to this country in respect of it, but that in respect of the Gulf section we should hold an important position. Until we have an opportunity of seeing precisely what the terms are it would be most improper to in any way condemn them; but I would ask His Majesty's Government to remember that they do hold a very strong position in this matter—namely the very strong position to which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in another place has called the attention of the country. They hold the position and the power given to them by the fact that they can refuse or admit the raising of the necessary revenue by the Turkish Government which is essential for the project to be carried out at all. They hold that power as trustees for the country, and I earnestly hope that they will not make terms, or allow terms to be made, adverse to this country whilst they have the power to prevent it. If they do, upon them must rest the responsibility.

Lord Curzon of Kedleston.—My Lords, there are only one or two points in the speech of the noble Viscount to which I may, perhaps, be allowed for one moment to refer. With the general tone and tenor of his speech I have nothing to express except gratification. I agree with him that a new chapter in the history of the East is likely to be opened if events follow the course which he indicated; and if the opening phases of that chapter are pursued in that tone of gravity and of friendly regard for the interests of all the Powers concerned which characterised his speech to-night, then I think we may hope that the solution will be a favourable one.

The points to which I desire for one moment to call attention are these. First, with regard to Persia. The noble Viscount read out *verbatim* the familiar assurance of the last Shah but one, Nasr-ud-din, about concessions to Great Britain for railways in Southern Persia. I imagined that he was going on from that to say either that a concession for a British railway would be applied for, or that, if it was applied for, the project would receive the warm support of His Majesty's Government; but, on the contrary, the noble Viscount proceeded to make—and as it was read I am sure it was a very formal and authorised statement—a declaration to the effect that, provided strategical and commercial considerations can be satisfied by an adequate British

participation in any railway schemes of the Persian Government in Southern Persia. His Majesty's Government would not construe their preferential rights in any exclusive spirit. I quite understand that position, but it is an apparent abandonment of the preferential rights which His Majesty's Government enjoy. It is not saying, as Sir Edward Grey rather suggested in the House of Commons, that if the Russians make a railway in Northern Persia we should respond by making an application in respect of Southern Persia. It only says that if the Persian Government make a railway in Southern Persia and that railway does not strategically interfere with our interests, we shall co-operate with them. I hope that will not be interpreted by anybody as in the slightest degree weakening the assurance given us by the Shah, or as disabling us in future from translating that pledge into action should occasion arise.

As to the Persian Gulf, I was glad to hear the noble Viscount adhere with so much emphasis to the statement made by Lord Lansdowne in May 1903. On the matter of the Muscat treaty, I agree with the observations made by the noble Lord behind me, Lord Lamington. I put this to the noble Viscount when he speaks about treaty rights—Does he really contend that the treaty rights which were contemplated when the Treaty of Muscat was effected cover or justify the sort of traffic which they are now held to extenuate? These are not treaty rights enjoyed by French subjects in the ordinary sense of the term. When I was in India they were treaty rights taken advantage of by two persons only: French merchants engaged in this traffic, who were protected by their country because they possessed important commercial interests in France. Are we to be told that in a case of that sort the French Government, as a matter of international practice, cannot give way without receiving territorial compensation in some other part of the world? I earnestly hope that they would be ashamed to ask for it; but, if they do ask for it, I hope His Majesty's Government will not be too generous in meeting them on the matter.

The noble Viscount dealt with the attitude of the late Government with regard to the Bagdad Railway in 1903. I will only say with regard to the new arrangement, the facts of which the noble Viscount put before us, that we shall look with great interest to see exactly what is the share in the new company from Bagdad to the Gulf which is to be claimed by the old German company. The German company affects to surrender its concession in return for the substantial advantages it gets at Alexandretta, but, nevertheless, it is to retain a share in whatever company is formed to construct the line from Bagdad to the Gulf. When the noble Viscount said that His Majesty's Government were prepared, if a solution were proposed entailing a factory to this country, to use their influence with the Sheikh of Kuwait for the provision of a suitable terminus for the railway at the port of Kuwait, I do not think he was saying anything different from the position taken up by Lord Lansdowne in 1903. The Government at that time gave a somewhat similar assurance. I ask His Majesty's Government before they embark upon this project for the extension of the railway to the Gulf to satisfy themselves that the last section from Bussorah to the Gulf is wanted in the interests of anybody. Is it wanted in the interests of the Turkish Government? Is it wanted in the interests of British trade or of Indian trade? Let His Majesty's Government remember that this section will be an expensive one to construct. For a distance of nearly 100 miles it would cross a desert. Then you get down to Kuwait itself. I know the harbour very well, and I know that a good deal of harbour work would be required before the place could be made ready for the accommodation of our ships, and therefore you have a very great outlay laid upon your new company there, every fresh outlay deepening the heavy financial obligations which the Turkish Government have been foolish enough to incur in regard to the earlier sections of the line. And how silly every one would look if, after the line was built, you found goods from India still being transferred into boats, still going up the river to Bussorah, and very likely on to Bagdad. I suggest the point to His Majesty's Government as one worthy of their consideration. After all, business has a good deal to say in these matters, and I merely warn the Government to look at them from a business point of view. I have now only to thank the noble Viscount for the papers which he has kindly promised to lay on the table of the House, and to withdraw my motion.



[11806]

No. 220.

*Lord Grimthorpe to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 31.)*

My dear Grey.

80, Portland Place, March 30, 1911.

I WRITE to inform you that I hear negotiations with the Government are proceeding satisfactorily at St. Petersburg. In case enquiries may be made from there about Mr. Williams, I think it well to let you know that he is not only the agent and representative of myself and the syndicate (which has been formed with a capital of 100,000L., to be called up as wanted), but is a principal, a partner, and a large shareholder in the business. He is an American, and is backed by powerful financial interests out there. Just before leaving Paris he negotiated a deal with some Paris bankers for building a railway in the west of America. I mention this as a Government always likes to deal with principals, and if he is thought to be only an agent it will seriously hamper him in the negotiations, and probably prevent their coming to any definite conclusion.

Yours sincerely,  
GRIMTHORPE.

[11570]

No. 221.

*Foreign Office to the Persian Transport Company.*

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 31, 1911.

I AM directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd ultimo, relative to the question of the construction railways in Persia.

I am to inform you, in reply to the enquiry contained in the paragraph of that communication, that Sir E. Grey would deprecate an application to the Persian Government for a railway concession either by your company, or by anyone else at the present moment, but that he will not lose sight of the assurances conveyed to the company in previous letters from this Office with regard to this question.

I am, &c.  
LOUIS MALLET.



*Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. February 1912.*

---

CONFIDENTIAL.

(9966.)

PART I.

---

EASTERN DEPARTMENT:

SECRET SERIES.

---

January to March 1911.